

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY—OCTOBER, 1919.

ENNIUS AND THE PUNIC WARS.

SINCE the days of Merula it has been regularly assumed by editors and critics of Ennius that, despite the express statement of Cicero to the contrary, the *Annales* did contain some narrative of the events of the first Punic War. Familiar as the passage in the *Brutus* is, it must be quoted once again: "Tamen illius quem uatibus et Faunis annumerat Ennius Bellum Punicum quasi Myronis opus delectat. Sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior: qui, si illum, ut simulat, contemneret, *non omnia bella persequens, primum illud Punicum, acerrimum bellum, reliquisset.*"

Is there any valid reason for refusing to accept this statement, strong and explicit as it is, at its face value? It is inconceivable that Cicero would have made it, knowing it to be untrue. To his generation the *Annales* was no remote or unfamiliar poem: on the contrary, it was immensely popular—was, in fact, one of the best known works in the whole range of Latin literature. Any statement made concerning it could be immediately and authoritatively tested, for almost contemporary texts were extant until a date much later than Cicero's. Materials for correction or confutation were, therefore, easy of access; yet no suggestion of contradiction has reached us from ancient sources. We cannot in common honesty brush Cicero's evidence contemptuously aside as do Lucian Mueller¹ and Vahlen,² we cannot distort it by a misinterpretation with Skutsch³ or a mistranslation with Valmaggi,⁴ we cannot leave it altogether undiscussed with Lenchantin de Gubernatis.⁵ Until we have definite proof of its falsity, we must believe that it is true. And that proof we most certainly have not. Probabilities are, indeed, all the other way. In the case of single lines and detached fragments, it is almost impossible to attain to anything like certainty: but an unprejudiced examination of the fragments themselves will show that we are absolutely unjustified in supposing that any one of them necessarily formed part of a narrative of the first Punic

¹ *Q. Ennius, Eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*, p. 168.

² *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, p. clxxix.

³ In Pauly-Wissowa, s.u. *Ennius* (col. 2607).

⁴ *Q. Ennio, I. Frammenti degli Annali*, p. 61.

⁵ *Ennio, Saggio Critico*.

War. One of those generally included in this supposititious narrative must, it is true, have some connexion with that war: one other refers to the *second* Punic War. But of the others it may be said that they apply to certain events in the war with Pyrrhus with at least as great appropriateness as to anything in the first Punic War.

I would suggest, then, that the war with Pyrrhus was treated on a scale so elaborate that it occupied part of the seventh book (where the first Punic War is generally placed) as well as the whole of the sixth. The earlier portion of the war, introduced by the famous exordium and by some notice of the antecedents of Pyrrhus, was the subject of Book VI. It is noteworthy that none of our fragments need refer to anything later than the battle of Asculum. Book VII. contained the Sicilian episode and the conclusion of the war, and opened with the *Primordia Carthaginiis*. Such a digression at such a point would be even more in place than as a prelude to the first Punic War, as it was during Pyrrhus' operations in Sicily that the train was laid. Ennius had the strongest of motives, both personal and artistic, for dwelling on the war with Pyrrhus while altogether omitting the longer and more important first Punic War. Nor need there be any difficulty in supposing that the narrative of a single war was carried on into a second book. The second Punic War is universally allowed two whole books; and in any case the divisions appear somewhat arbitrary, and are arguably not the work of Ennius himself, but of the grammarian Vargunteius.

It remains to examine the fragments themselves:¹

1. Appius indixit Karthaginiensibus bellum.

Quoted (without exact reference or author's name) by Cicero. *Referred* to the outbreak of war.

2. Mulserat huc nauem compulsam fluctibus pontus.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Priscian.

3. Et melior naus quam quae stalaria portat.

Quoted (without exact reference) by scholiast (*ad Iuu.* VII. 134). *Referred* (with [2]) to the wrecked Carthaginian galley.

4. . . . tonsas ante tenentes

Parerent, obseruarent, portisculus signum

Cum dare coepisset.

Quoted (from Book VIII.) by Nonius.

5. Poste recumbite, uestraque pectora pellite tonsis.

6. Pone petunt; exim referunt ad pectora tonsas.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Festus. *Referred* (with [4]) to the preliminary drill of the Roman sailors (260 B.C.).

¹ I give, following the text and arrangement of Vahlen, those which are referred to the first Punic War by Mueller and Valmaggi as well as by Vahlen himself.

Quoted
Regul

Quoted
and la
left un

T
Punic
dating
possib
would
of his
Enniu
told t
prieat
of the
the ré

F
storm
own s
Pyrrh
ῶραν
κυβε
δὲ ἄλλ
τῆς 'I
βαλεῖ
χαλεπ
τῆς β
διέφευ

T
refer
mean
N
Book
refer
ordine

¹ Thi
book to

7. Denique ui magna quadrupes eques atque elephant
Proiciunt sese. . . .

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Gellius and others. *Referred* to the defeat of Regulus by the Carthaginians under Xanthippus.

8. Alter nare cupit; alter pugnare paratust.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Festus. *Referred* to the sea power of Carthage and land power of Rome (Mueller), or to the battle of Ecnomus (Valmaggi), or left uncertain (Vahlen).

The first of these fragments plainly refers to the outbreak of the first Punic War. But need it be anything more than a 'time note,' a means of dating some other event (with *postquam* at the end of the line before)? Or possibly it may belong to the *scripsere alii rem* passage. On this assumption it would be, in effect, a parody of Naevius, perhaps an hexameter version of one of his own Saturnians, introduced as a specimen of the narrative style that Ennius affected to despise. The gist of the passage would be 'others have told the tale—and this is how they did it.' The line would find an appropriate place at the end of the *Primordia Carthaginiis*, to account for the omission of the most momentous event in Carthaginian history, the natural climax of the résumé already given.

Fragments 2 and 3 I would place together, as describing the effects of the storm that overtook Pyrrhus on his voyage to Italy and the excellence of his own ship which enabled him to weather it for a time: cf. Plutarch, *Life of Pyrrhus*, Ch. XV.: καὶ μέσον ἔχων τὸν Ἴόνιον, ἀρπάζεται βορέα ἀνέμῳ πᾶρ' ὦραν ἐκραγέντι. καὶ βιασθεὶς αὐτὸς μὲν ἀρετῇ καὶ προθυμίᾳ ναυτῶν καὶ κυβερνητῶν ἐξανέφερε καὶ προσανῆγε τῇ γῇ πολυπόνως καὶ παραβόλως, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου στόλου συγχυθέντος καὶ τῶν νεῶν σκεδασθεισῶν, αἱ μὲν ἀποσφαλεῖσαι τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐξεώσθησαν εἰς τὸ Λιβυκὸν καὶ Σικελικὸν πέλαγος, τὰς δὲ ὑπερβαλεῖν μὴ δυνηθείσας ἄκραν Ἰαυπυγίαν νύξ τε κατελάμβανε καὶ πολλή καὶ χαλεπή θάλασσα παίονσα πρὸς χωρία δύσορμα καὶ τυφλὰ πάσας διέφθειρε πλὴν τῆς βασιλικῆς. Αὕτη δὲ πελαγίου μὲν ἔτι ὄντος τοῦ κύματος, ἡμύνετο καὶ διέφευγε μεγέθει καὶ ῥώμῃ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς θαλάσσης.

The comparison in No. 3 would gain in point and aptness, as we could refer it to the other ships which carried the impedimenta and animals. Its meaning would be that the king's ship was the best in the whole fleet.¹

No. 4 plainly belongs to the second Punic War. It is quoted from Book VIII., and nothing is gained by refusing to accept the number. The reference, no doubt, is to the 'sham fights' described by Livy: "Hunc ordinem laboris quietisque quoad Carthagine morati sunt, seruauerunt.

¹ This involves a change in the number of the book to which (2) belongs. But numerals are notoriously easy of confusion.

Remigium classicique milites tranquillo in altum euecti agilitatem nauium simulacris naualis pugnae experiebantur" (XXVI. 51).¹

Nos. 5 and 6 have been with common consent referred to the famous drill of 260 B.C., elaborately described by Polybius. But that was not the only occasion on which sailors were drilled: nor is there any hint of the special feature of that drill—namely, that it was carried out *on land*. Ennius' language would apply equally well to drill on the water: it might conceivably refer to an actual order and its carrying out, if the crews were badly trained or unwilling. We are, then, probably concerned with the 'pressed men' of Pyrrhus, either when they were first enrolled, when they must have been drilled, or during the encounter which he had with the Carthaginian fleet on his return voyage to Italy. We know that his unwilling recruits were specifically intended for rowers:

Εὐτυχία δὲ καὶ ῥώμη τῶν παρόντων ἐπαιρόμενος καὶ διώκων τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐφ' αἷς ὑπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπλευσε πρώτης δὲ Λιβύης ἐφιέμενος καὶ ναὺς ἔχων πολλὰς πληρωμάτων ἐπιδεεῖς, ἡγείρεν ἐρέτας, οὐκ ἐπικεικῶς ἐντυγχάνων ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικῶς καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν βιαζόμενος καὶ κολάζων. . . . (Life, Ch. XXIII.).

If the lines refer to an actual order, it would most naturally be given at the moment when he had decided to concentrate his efforts on getting through to Italy, as he ultimately did.² To the same moment the last fragment (No. 8) may well belong. Its meaning has been much disputed; but it can be understood, quite simply and literally, to mean 'one side [Pyrrhus] is eager to advance upon its way, the other [Carthage] is ready for the fight.'³

Our one remaining fragment can be referred to a retreat, even a disorderly retreat, as well as to an advance; and the most striking event of the battle of Beneventum was the panic inspired among τὰ θηρία of Pyrrhus by the Roman fire:

. . . καὶ συμβαλὼν ἐκ προδήλου, τὸ μὲν ἐτρέψατο τῶν πολεμίων, ἔστι δ' ἢ βιασθεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων καὶ συσταλεῖς πρὸς τὸ στρατόπεδον τοὺς φύλακας ἐκάλει συχοὺς ἐφεστῶτας τῷ χάρακι μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων καὶ ἀκμῆτας. οἱ δὲ ἐπιφανέντες ἐκ τόπων ὀχυρῶν καὶ τὰ θηρία βάλλοντες ἠνάγκασαν ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ φυγῇ χωροῦντα διὰ τῶν συμμάχων ὀπίσω ταραχὴν ἀπεργάσασθαι καὶ σύγχυσιν. . . . (Life, Ch. XXV.).

However, whether these individual ascriptions be right or wrong, it is surely unreasonable to maintain that the *first* Punic War contains the only events to which the lines in question can refer. And once that is admitted, there is no longer the slightest justification for refusing to take the word of Cicero.

ETHEL MARY STEUART.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

¹ This possibility Vahlen admits (though the other editors do not), and quotes this and the similar passage in XXXV. 26 (referring to the war with Antiochus).

² Life, Ch. XXIV.

³ 'Nare' meaning simply to move through or over the water.

NOTE.—War conditions made it impossible for me to see Norden's *Ennius und Vergilius* until after my own conclusions on the probable contents of Book VII. were fully formed. I rejoice to find that he too maintains, in the warmest possible language, that Cicero's statement must be believed. "Ein unzweideutigeres Zeugnis," he says, "dafür dass Ennius jenen Krieg (the first Punic War) absichtlich übergang (*relinquere* bedeutet etwas absichtlich unbeachtet lassen) lässt sieht, so sollte man glauben, nicht wohl vorstellen. Der Zeuge ist der denkbar beste" (*op. cit.* p. 63).

He, too, makes 'Appius indixit,' etc., a mere date; and, though referring Fragments 2-6 and 8 to the drill of 260 B.C., he supposes the description of it formed part of the *Primordia Carthaginiis*. His main theory seems to be that Book VII. contained the events of 235 B.C. and later.

SOME GLOSSES IN THE TEXT OF SOPHOCLES.

IN attempting to determine the text of Sophocles in the places presently to be discussed, it is not my purpose to put forward a series of novelties which, though more or less plausible, are essentially incapable of proof. I seek rather to plead for the reception of certain ascertained but neglected variants, and to establish their claims by a survey of the relevant evidence. After a somewhat prolonged study of the data, I am convinced that the chief hope of progress—apart from the discovery of fresh material—lies in a more methodical use of the ancient scholia and lexicographers. Although their value has long been acknowledged, they have been employed unintelligently or at haphazard, largely because the character of their information and its sources have been imperfectly understood. One of the chief aids which they afford is in passages where the genuine reading has been displaced by an explanatory gloss. This is a possibility which critics have always recognized, but, while ready enough to suggest that the word selected for expulsion is a gloss on some other, they frequently fail to demonstrate that it is used as a gloss at all. Leaving such guess-work aside, we shall still find various grades of probability. It should be a minimum requirement that the word removed from the text is, either itself or as one of a class, a well-attested gloss of the proposed substitute. Thus in *El.* 800, where LA with most other MSS. have *καταξίως*, but four of the *recentiores* *κατ' ἀξίαν*, I think that Bothe and Monk were right in preferring *κατάξι' ἄν*. Jebb objects that the change is improbable. Surely not, when it is observed that the adverbial use of the neut. acc. plur. is regularly glossed by the form in *-ως*. So *El.* 164 *ἀκάματα*] *ἀκαμάτως*. *Ai.* 196 *ἀτάρβητα*] *ἀντὶ ἀταρβήτως*. *Ant.* 527 *φιλάδελφα*] *φιλαδέλφως*. *O.C.* 319 *φαιδρά δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ φαιδρῶς*. In *Ant.* 446 it is perverse to prefer *συντόμως* to *σύντομα* merely because the former is supported by L and the latter by A, especially when Lb gives the tell-tale reading *σύντομα* with *συντόμως* superscript. But we shall have still greater confidence in the result if we can show that one of two variants recorded in the apparatus is the habitual equivalent of the other. In such a case probability comes as near to certainty as the contingent nature of the problem admits. I hope presently to bring forward some such instances, but before doing so I wish to show the injury done by glosses in cases where the evidence of their intrusion is, I think, unimpeachable.

In *O.C.* 1068 sqq. our MSS. give *πᾶσα δ' ὀρμᾶται κατ' ἀμ|πυκτήρια φάλαρα πῶλων | ἄμβασις*. But Hesych. I. p. 153 has *ἀμπυκτήρια· τὰ φάλαρα*. Σοφοκλῆς

Οἰδίποδ
shows
τὸν ἐγρ
with φ
length
nized t
at the
synaph
Herma
attempt
accept
states
the ho
the pa
4. 511
sugge
author
But to
credib
passa
howe
possib
'all t
then
?
γὰρ ἰ
L wr
of A
ταύρ
the i
was
πέτρ
Jebb
caus
the p
note
of λ
Phil
that
less
the
θρα
the
as a

Οιδίποδι ἐν Κολωνῷ, obviously in reference to this passage. Moreover, metre shows that 1069 is seriously corrupted, since the antistrophic line ἐνθ' οἶμαι τὸν ἐγρεμάχαν—a choriambic (polyschematist) dimeter—does not correspond with φάλαρα πώλων, while indicating that ἀμπυκτήρι(α) with the last letter lengthened or elided answers to ἐνθ' οἶμαι τόν. Hence it is generally recognized that φάλαρα πώλων must go, and that either there is a hiatus after κατὰ at the end of 1068 or else κατὰ has taken the place of an iambic word with synaphea. Jebb adopts Schneidewin's καθείσ' (as an easier change than Hermann's χαλῶσ') with Wecklein's ἀμπυκτήρια στομίων. But the consequent attempt to show that ἀμπυκτήρια can be interpreted 'reins' is difficult to accept; for the schol. min. on Aesch. *Theb.* 448, on which reliance is placed, states no more than that ἀμπυκτήρες was applied to the straps which fasten the horse's bridle round his head. That is reasonable enough. Although in the passage of Aeschylus—ἵππους δ' ἐν ἀμπυκτήρσιν ἐμβριμωμένας—as in Quint. 4. 511, to which also appeal is made, the words ἀμπυκτήρ and ἄμπυξ, as suggesting trappings in general, might loosely be equated with χαλινός, all the authorities concur in stating that the strict meaning is *frontlet* or *head-piece*. But to drop or loosen the frontlets in order to accelerate the speed is hardly a credible proceeding. The true reading is probably beyond recovery, and the passage is quoted to show how much mischief a gloss may cause. It may, however, be suggested that a tolerable meaning is obtainable with the least possible alteration by reading κατὰ | ἀμπυκτήρι' <ἀντιπάλων> to be rendered 'all the mounted men are moving against the frontlets of the foe.' For κατὰ then compare Xen. *Cyr.* VI. 3. 12 ἵππεῖς προελαύνουσι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς.

The detection of a gloss will remove a notorious crux in *O.T.* 476 φοιτᾷ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγρίαν | ὕλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα καὶ | πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος. The first hand of L wrote πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος, which is corrected to πέτρας ὡς ταῦρος, the reading of A and the majority of the MSS. Lb and a few others have πετραῖος ὡς ταῦρος, two πέτρας ὡς ταῦρος (these readings deserve notice as representing the intermediate stages of the corruption). The faulty metre of the vulgate was patched up by Dorville, who supposed that ὡς was a gloss on αἶτε, with πέτρας αἶτε ταῦρος, and Martin's well-known πέτρας ἰσόταυρος was adopted by Jebb, Kennedy, and Tyrrell. I contend that the whole of the trouble was caused by the writing of ὡς above the article as an explanatory gloss to indicate the presence of a metaphor. I have given examples of this intrusion in the note on Soph. fr. 279 τραχὺς χελώνης κέρχνος ἐξανίσταται. Similar instances of λείπει τὸ ὡς will be found in the Sophoclean scholia in *Trach.* 14, 1259, and *Phil.* 727, and deserve careful attention. Now it appears from his Appendix that Jebb would have defended πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος but for two objections. The less serious of these, that πετραῖος cannot be used as a local adverb (= 'among the rocks'), is removed by Soph. fr. 581. 3 (usually assigned to Aeschylus) θρασὺν πετραῖον ὄρνιν ἐν παντευχίᾳ. The second is the supposed harshness of the substitution of a metaphor for a simile. But the refusal to recognize this as a thoroughly idiomatic type is the outcome of the same tendency which

furthered the interpolation of ὥς. Cf. e.g. fr. 800 *Λυδία λίθος σίδηρον τηλόθεν προσηγάγου*, where Jebb consistently required the addition of ὥς. Anyone who feels a doubt as to the range of the idiom should consult the full collections of Professor P. Shorey in *Class. Phil.* IV. 433 and of Blaydes on *Ar. Lys.* 694. In the present connexion it is important to remember that it is especially frequent in allusions to beast-fables: Cratin. fr. 52 οἱ δὲ πυππάζουσι περιτρέχοντες, ὁ δ' ὄνος ὕεται. Theogn. 347 ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην, | χειμαρρῷ ποταμῷ πάντ' ἀποσεισάμενος. An objection may be raised in regard to the presence of the article. The difference, I suppose, is this. When present, it marks an express reference to a known fable. Otherwise, the substance of the fable is re-stated as not necessarily familiar.

In *El.* 947 L gives ἄκουε δὴ νυν ἢ βεβούλευμαι ποεῖν, whereas A, supported by a considerable majority of the other MSS., has τελεῖν in place of ποεῖν. In the margin, but in a later hand, L has the variant γρ. τελεῖν. τελεῖν remained the vulgate until Dindorf substituted ποιεῖν in his edition of 1860. He has been followed by the majority of subsequent editors for no other reason that I can discover than blind deference to the authority of L. No one appears to have raised the question why one of the alternatives was substituted for the other. Yet the answer is not far to seek. ποιεῖν was a gloss introduced for the purpose of explaining that τελεῖν means 'to carry into effect.' See Hesych. IV. p. 140 τελῶμεν : ποιῶμεν, which is referred to Hom. δ 776 ἀνάσταντες τελέωμεν μῦθον ('accomplish the plan'). Phot. τελεῖ· ἐπιτελεῖ, ποιεῖ. Still more cogent is *O.C.* 13, where the διορθώτης has written πο above the first syllable of τελεῖν, but whether as gloss or variant it is impossible to say. I cannot think that anyone who considers these facts will advocate the retention of ποεῖν. But the consequences are more important than the establishment of this particular reading. If A has preserved the genuine tradition which L has lost, how can we refuse in other cases to judge its evidence upon the merits? Indeed, the question is no longer open, now that the papyri have shown that even the inferior MSS. occasionally preserve an old variant, as is the case in *O.T.* 827. We may, therefore, hesitate to conclude that such remarkable readings as προνοούμενῳ of M Ven in *O.T.* 685 and ἐν χεροῖν of M in *O.T.* 1031, both of which anticipate modern conjectures, are actually due to Byzantine interpolation.

In *O.T.* 87 sq. our MSS., supported by Stob. *flor.* 108. 54, have λέγω γὰρ καὶ τὰ δύσφορ' εἰ τύχοι | κατ' ὀρθὸν ἐξελθόντα πάντ' ἂν εὐτυχεῖν, while Suid. Zonar. vv. δύσφορα differ in offering ἐξιόντα for ἐξελθόντα, and agree with some of our scholia in explaining it by προϊόντα. I believe no one has found anything to say in favour of ἐξιόντα. Jebb, like Dindorf before him, calls it 'a mere error.' Blaydes says it is a frequent error of the copyists, which is a cryptic utterance. Facts point to another story. Hesych. II. p. 126 explains ἐξίμεναι by ἐξελθεῖν, agreeing with schol. H λ 531, and correspondingly ἴωμεν by ἐλθωμεν, ἴων by ἐλθών. Apollon. *lex. Hom.* v. ἴων drops a hint of the grammarians' purpose by his glosses πορευόμενος ἢ συντελικῶς ἐλθών. ἐπεὶ πᾶσα μετοχὴ ὀξύτονος εἰς

—ων λή
that its
I. 211, 2
Ant. 74
in O.T.
rendered
ἐλθόντα
Am

Arist. *rh*
mind; i
since to
likeliho
is susp
O 402
from A
ἐνεργου
δηλοῖ δι
IV. p.
quoting
σπουδῇ
favour
O.

p. 1809
leading
right.'
Eustat
ἀραιὸν
a defec
that E
duced,
possibl
above
text of
from
ἐλασι
ἐλὼν·
place
ἐλήφθ
Aesch
and th

1 Thi
loose qu
thius.
merits a

—ων λήγουσά ἐστιν συντελική, quoting Hom. γ 286. Actually they held that its accent showed ἰών to be a second aorist participle: Cramer *Anecd. Ox.* I. 211, 20. Hence, whenever the context pointed to a complete action, as in *Ant.* 742, they glossed it with ἐλθών, but, if the action was continuing, as in *O.T.* 324, with ἐρχόμενος. See also schol. rec. Aesch. *Pers.* 248 ἰόντων rendered as ἀπελθόντων, *ib.* 646 ἰόντ' αἰνέσατε by αἰνέσατ' ἐλθεῖν (schol. M: ἐλθόντα schol. rec.). Is there any longer a doubt as to the origin of ἐξελθόντα?

Ant. 223 ἀναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὐχ ὅπως τάχους ὑπο | δύσπνους ἰκάνω is quoted by Arist. *rhet.* 3. 14. 1415b 20 with σπουδῆς for τάχους. The editors are not of one mind; for Aristotle commands more respect than Suidas. Jebb argues that, since τάχους is free from objection, it should not be displaced, in view of the likelihood that Aristotle quoted from memory. We must answer that τάχους is suspect for the very reason that it is convertible with σπουδῆς. Hom. O 402 σπεύσομαι] ταχυνῶ schol. B. That this was the ordinary gloss appears from Aristicus on Δ 232 ἡ διπλή ὅτι τὸ σπεύδοντας οὐχ οἶον ταχύνοντας ἀλλ' ἐνεργούντας καὶ κακοπαθούντας. B 99 σπουδῇ is interpreted by schol. BL μόγης· δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ ταχέως, quoting Hom. O 209 σπουδῇ νῦν ἀνάβαινε. Hesych. IV. p. 68 calls this the ordinary sense of σπουδή (ἡ συνήθης ἡμῖν σπουδή), quoting the same passage, which he glosses by μετὰ τάχους. Schol. A: ὅτι σπουδῇ λέγει οὐχ οἶον ἐν τάχει ἀλλὰ μόγης καὶ δυσχερῶς. That is the case in favour of Aristotle.

O.T. 276 ὥσπερ μ' ἀραῖον ἔλαβες ὥδ' ἀναξ ἐρῶ is quoted in part by Eustath. p. 1809, 14 with εἶλες in place of ἔλαβες. Jebb's note (after Blaydes) is misleading: 'the paraphrase of Eustath. ὥσπερ με εἶλες διὰ τῆς ἀρᾶς is substantially right.' But, if he had verified the reference, he must have noticed that Eustathius, before giving his paraphrase introduced by ἡγουν, quotes ὥσπερ μ' ἀραῖον εἶλες as the actual words of Sophocles. Dindorf ascribes the variant to a defect of memory; but that is not Eustathius' way.¹ It is possible of course that Eustathius or his source, finding ἔλαβες in the document to be reproduced, wrote down εἶλες owing to some casual perversity. But then it is also possible that the copyist of the archetype of our MSS., finding ἔλαβες written above εἶλες, adopted what he took to be a correction instead of adhering to the text of his exemplar.² Which is the more probable alternative may be inferred from the following glosses of Suidas: εἶλεν· ἔλαβεν, αἰρήσομαι· λήψομαι, ἔλωσι· καταλάβωσι, and of Hesychius: αἰρήσασθαι· λαβεῖν, εἶλεν· λαβεῖν, ἐλὼν· λαβὼν, εἶλετο· ἔλαβεν. In Eur. *Hipp.* 657 ἡρέθην was restored in place of εὔρέθην by the Dutch critic Pierson on the strength of the scholiast's ἐλήφθην. These facts lend some support to Paley's ὀρκίοις αἰρουμένους in Aesch. *Eum.* 486. For the reasons given I think that Eustathius was right, and that the tradition of our MSS. has been corrupted.

¹ This is not to say that there are no such loose quotations embedded in the text of Eustathius. Each case must be judged on its own merits and no such general inference as is drawn

by Jebb in *Antig.* p. 250 is justifiable.

² λαβεῖν ὀρκίοις is just as good Greek as εἶλεν: cf. Hdt. 3. 74. *O.C.* 284 is too doubtful to be put into the scale.

Here I must claim to digress in order to say a few words on the evidence of Eustathius in general. Much misunderstanding has arisen from treating him as an independent critic who controlled his material by the exercise of a free judgement. It should be clearly understood that the chief instruments which he employed were scissors and paste. To hold otherwise is to misconceive the character of his work, and seriously to impair the value of his testimony. His copious references to documents of the classical era do not imply that he had access to originals which we have lost. For that part of his text which is of value to us he was the unintelligent copyist of his technical authorities, the last repository of grammatical learning which had been put into circulation more than 1,000 years before his date. Ignoring this, Jebb¹ has drawn from his citation of *Antig.* 1167, which is lost in our MSS., the extraordinary inference that a class of MSS. containing the verse was still extant in the twelfth century. Equally baseless is Dindorf's suggestion, that Eustathius copied the line from Athenaeus who twice quotes it,² and that the ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα to whose authority he appeals were MSS. not of Sophocles but of Athenaeus. Eustathius, it is true, often reproduces extracts from Athenaeus, but the context proves that he has not done so here. Athenaeus says nothing at all about the critical question, but his quotations form part of a series designed to show that as an advocate of hedonism Epicurus did not stand alone. Eustathius, on the other hand, contrasts the serviceable addition of a line in the correct copies of Sophocles with the interpolation by Zenodotus of Hom. N 731. The only legitimate inference is that Eustathius extracted his material from the collection of Apion and Herodorus which is established as being one of his chief sources.³

The recognition of Eustathius' authority is essential to the restoration of *Ai.* 966 ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς. No parallel has been produced to justify the supposed equivalence of ἢ to μᾶλλον ἢ; for it is idle to quote passages like βούλομαι ἐγὼ λαὸν σόον ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι, where the idea of preference is implicit in the verb (Kuehner-Gerth II. p. 304). There is, however, good reason to believe that the grammatical tradition supported not ἢ but ἡ. Eustathius, p. 1521. 35,⁴ explaining the epithet ἀγχίθεοι as applied to the Phaeacians in Hom. E 35, mentions the interpretation διὰ τὸ φιλόξενον καὶ τὴν λουπὴν ἀρετὴν, and refers to η 206 ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν, | ὥσπερ Κύκλωπες τε καὶ ἄγρια φύλα γιγάντων. In a note on that passage (p. 1577. 24) he explains that the resemblance of the Phaeacians to the gods in point of righteousness is parallel to the resemblance between Cyclopes and Giants κατὰ ἀδικίαν, just as the relation between Socrates and Plato might be compared to

¹ *Ant.* p. lii; text edition p. xxi.

² 280 B; 547 C.

³ The reference to Ζηνόδοτος ὁ Μαλλώτης is decisive: see Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1464.

⁴ The silence of most editors—Jebb does not mention Eustathius—led me to suppose that I was the first to notice the importance of this

evidence, until I discovered the article of Schneidewin in *Philol.* IV 472. But Schneidewin does not bring out the strength of his case, and his view of the whole speech does not commend itself. Anyhow the matter well deserves re-statement.

that betw
according
τὸ ἀψίνθον
the sweet
the line of
sion is irro
it is possib
it is essen
mind that
θιον (scho
article of
reason, or
show whic
for ἡ κείν
go back
credit as
clusion is
example of
indefensib
sense, see
its bearing
Nauck, n
its allegor
I think, v
words ἡ
furnishes
Modern s
which is
expected
offered b
(*Ai.* 79 οἱ
denied to
them'—t
has obtai
emphatic
how she
question
What is
ἐστίν?
first com
least I in
to the la

¹ The fr
For similar

that between Anytus and Meletus. There is a likeness between opposites according to the relation of their qualities. Thus, *τόσον ἡδὺ τὸ μέλι ὅσον ἀηδὲς τὸ ἀψίνθιον*. The substances named are selected as typical of the bitter and the sweet (Menand. fr. 708 K.). A similar example, he concludes, is to be found in the line of Sophocles *ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς*. But the whole discussion is irrelevant if *ἢ* is read; and, as there is no critical edition of Eustathius, it is possible that *ἢ* may be found in some one or other of the copies. Anyhow, it is essential to his argument. Nor does Eustathius stand alone. Bearing in mind that *γλεῦκος* sometimes takes the place of *μέλι* as the contrary of *ἀψίνθιον* (schol. Nic. *Alex.* 298), we may fairly believe that the miserably mutilated article of Suidas (v. *γλεῦκος*), in which *Ai.* 966 is quoted without any apparent reason, once covered the same ground as Eustathius. As straws are said to show which way the wind blows, the fact that codex V of Suidas has *ὡς κείνοις* for *ἢ κείνοις* is not without significance. Since Eustathius and Suidas clearly go back to an old-inherited tradition, they are entitled to at least as much credit as the consensus of our MSS., such as it is, in favour of *ἢ*.¹ The conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the line is quoted as an undoubted example of a familiar idiom. When we remember that the vulgate contains an indefensible solecism, the reasons for preferring *ἢ*, if it yields any tolerable sense, seem to be overwhelming. But it is also intrinsically more probable in its bearing on the context. Tecmessa's speech has been mangled by critics like Nauck, not only for its supposed numerical superfluity, but also by reason of its alleged incoherence. Jebb has combated this point of view, though not, as I think, with entire success, particularly in his artificial interpretation of the words *ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς*. My submission is that the evidence of Eustathius furnishes a clue which assists the discovery of the whole train of thought. Modern sentiment should not blind us to the main intention of the speaker, which is to drive home her conviction that Ajax has baffled his enemies' expected triumph, as they will presently discover. The supreme guerdon offered by a commonplace morality, the joy of exalting over a prostrate foe (*Ai.* 79 *οὐκουν γέλως ἡδιστος εἰς ἐχθροὺς γελᾶν*; Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 550), is now denied to them. 'Grant that his death is no less bitter to me than sweet to them'—these are secondary issues. The main result is that Ajax is satisfied: he has obtained his heart's desire. How can they then gloat over *him* (*τοῦδ'* strongly emphatic)? The gods, not the Atridae, are the authors of his death. Notice how she recurs to her previous assertions in 950 and 952. Here arises a question as to the precise import of the elastic datives *θεοῖς* and *κείνοισιν*. What is the meaning of *οὐ κείνοις τέθνηκεν* shortly followed by *αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν*? Surely, however Sophocles apprehended their syntactical relation, the first combination must express the cause, and the second the effect. So at least I infer from Eur. *Andr.* 334 *τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καὶ μ' ἀπώλεσεν*. As to the last three lines, once seize the notion that emphasis is laid upon the

¹ The first hand of L. may have written *ἢ* on O.C. 1131 and Plat. *Phaed.* 80 B. For similar confusions see the critical apparatus

contrast of Αἶας and ἐμοί, and everything falls into its place. 'Odysseus may mock us, but his taunts are idle. Ajax himself is beyond their reach, and it is I for whom his passing leaves pain and lamentation.' In other words, my misery is the counterpart of their ultimate failure.

El. 686 sq. δρόμον δ' ἰσώσας τῇ φύσει τὰ τέρματα
νίκης ἔχων ἐξῆλθε πάντιμον γέρας.

I follow the ancient interpreters in requiring the meaning, that Orestes issued from the context with an achievement worthy of his physical aspect. The thought is almost a commonplace in Pindar: *Ol.* 8. 19 ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργω τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων, 9. 94 ὠραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά τε ῥέξας, *Nem.* 3. 19 τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει. εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' εὐκίότα μορφῇ κτέ., *Isth.* 7. 21 φέρει γὰρ Ἴσθμοὶ νίκαν παγκρατίου· σθένει τ' ἔκπαγλος ἰδεῖν τε μορφάεις· ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἰσχίον φυᾶς. From the closeness of the parallel it looks as if Sophocles had these or similar passages in mind. It follows that Musgrave's ingenious τὰφέσει should be abandoned as a false trail. On the other hand, I agree that it is well-nigh impossible to extract the desired meaning from the text, notwithstanding Kaibel's argument that τέρματα δρόμον is to be regarded as the equivalent of νίκη. Let us see if the textual data yield any assistance: δρόμον LA: δρόμον T: δρόμω Suid. v. δρόμοις. ἰσῶσαι (ἰσώσας E) Suid. τέρματα] πράγματα Suid. Obviously the chief problem is to discover how Suidas got his extraordinary reading πράγματα. It should not be put aside as a mere eccentricity; for the answer to the puzzle is supplied by Hesych. II p. 183 ἔργματα: πράγματα. Similarly Suid. ἔρδειν· πράττειν. ἔρδοι· πράττοι. Apollon. *lex. Hom.* ἔρδειν· ἐπὶ τοῦ πράσσειν. schol. Eur. *Or.* 159 ἐργμάτων] πράξεων. I hold accordingly that ἔργματα must once have stood in the text of Sophocles, and also that its presence is indicated by schol. L, who, after giving a paraphrase adapted to τέρματα, continues ἄλλως· ὁμοίως καὶ ἴσως τεθνασµένος ἐν τῷ ἀγωνίσματι ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ μορφῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς θαυµαστὸς ἐπὶ τῇ μορφῇ οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ ἐφάνη, ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ εἶδει οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ. It should be added that G. Wolff conjectured τότε ἔργματα for τὰ τέρματα. That will hardly do, and I should prefer δρόμον . . . τά τ' ἔργματα, which would form a hendiadys similar to *Al.* 814 τάχος γὰρ ἔργου καὶ ποδῶν ἅμ' ἔψεται and to *O.C.* 1297 οὐτ' εἰς ἐλεγχον χειρὸς οὐτ' ἔργου μολών.

Ant. 368 νόμους παρείρων χθονός.

παρείρων is by general admission a *vox nihili*, and Reiske's γεραίρων may fairly be said to hold the field. This is well enough, although it is more naturally adapted to a personal object. But I cannot call it 'a certain correction,' as Jebb does, seeing that it fails to account for the gloss πληρῶν which is found in A and Lb as well as in L (ὁ πληρῶν τὸν νόμον καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην: cf. St. Paul *Rom.* 13. 10 πλήρωμα νόμου ἢ ἀγάπη). This rather suggests an original with the sense 'fulfilling' or 'carrying out'—a requirement

which is sa
588 περαίν
πληροῖ. ἀνύ
and palaeo

Ant. 9

The ar

was promp

πελάγειον,

do, Wiesel

according t

and the wo

τρηχείης σ

it was misi

πετρῶν ha

(πελαγείων

γ 298 σπ

περιειλημ

τῇ θαλάσσ

Apollon. l

There rem

modification

Having

demonstra

restoration

γούους | οὐ

the strait

Seidler, I

Schaefer a

ellipse: C

Schneidev

μὲν οὖν ἐς

if only b

independe

proper';

choose or

content v

But we c

by readi

tragedian

illustrate

τινά τινα

fem.) cf.

which is satisfied by Pflugk's *περαίνων*, as may be seen from schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 588 *περαίνει* · ἦτοι πληροῖ and Hesych. III p. 308 *περαίνει* · ἐπὶ πέρασ ἄγει. πληροῖ. ἀνύει. The employment of *περαίνων* in this sense needs no justification, and palaeographically it is as easy as *γεραίρων*.

Ant. 966 *παρὰ δὲ κυανέων πελάγεων πετρῶν διδύμας ἁλός.*

The antistrophe shows that there are two syllables in excess and *πετρῶν* was promptly ejected as a gloss. Turnebus, who preferred to get rid of *πελάγεων*, has had few followers. Since, however, 'Cyanean seas' will never do, Wieseler in 1857 proposed to substitute *σπιλάδων* for *πελάγεων*, into which, according to Dindorf, it was corrupted. *σπιλάδων* is an attractive conjecture, and the word is applied to the Symplegades in Apoll. Rh. 2. 550 *στενωπὸν . . . τρηχεῖης σπιλάδεσσιν ἐεργμένον ἀμφοτέρωθεν*. But it is not very probable that it was misread as *πελάγεων*, and I wonder that those who discovered a gloss in *πετρῶν* have not seen that the intrusive element was rather *πελαγίων* (*πελαγείων*) *πετρῶν*. The likelihood of this may be inferred from schol. Hom. γ 298 *σπιλάδεσσι δὲ ταῖς παραλίας πέτραις . . . ἢ ταῖς κατὰ θάλασσαν περιειλημέναις ἐν ὀλίγῳ ὕδατι*. Hesych. IV. p. 66 *σπιλάδες* · αἱ περιεχόμεναι τῇ θαλάσῃ πέτραι. Eustath. p. 1468. 28 αἱ παράλιαι πέτραι. Suid., Phot., Apollon. *lex.* Hom. Ἡλιδωρος (qu. Ἡρόδωρος) δὲ τὰς παραθαλασσίας πέτρας. There remains the insuperable difficulty of *παρὰ* c. gen. which suggests a modification of Wieseler's conjecture to *κυανέων σπιλάδων*.

Having so far confined myself to cases where a certain measure of demonstration is possible, I will end by contributing a pure guess towards the restoration of *Ant.* 1246 sqq. *ἐλπίσιν δὲ βόσκομαι | ἄχῃ τέκνου κλύουσιν ἐς πόλιν γόους | οὐκ ἀξιώσειν*. The oddness of the Greek is sufficiently indicated by the straits to which editors are reduced in searching for an explanation. Seidler, Erfurdt, Wunder and Dindorf supply *στένειν* from what follows, Schaefer and apparently Ellendt *προτιθέναι*. Others more boldly talk of an ellipse: Campbell, in a very vague note, of *ποιεῖν*, Dorville of *πέμπειν*, and Schneidewin-Nauck of *γοᾶσθαι*. (Observe that the idiom of Ar. *Ran.* 1279 *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐς τὸ βαλανεῖον βούλομαι*, which Dorville compares, is entirely different, if only by the absence of anything corresponding to *γόους*.) Jebb takes an independent line, construing *οὐκ ἀξιώσειν γόους* 'will not think lamentations proper'; but it is not clear how he deals with *ἐς πόλιν*. If I were forced to choose one of these, my vote would be given to Schaefer;¹ but rather than be content with the text as it stands, I should incline towards Blaydes's *ἐξανήσειν*. But we can get much closer to the MSS., and obtain exactly the sense required, by reading *ἐξισώσειν*—a word which Sophocles uses alone of the three tragedians, and with a certain boldness of elaboration. I need not stay to illustrate the ordinary uses of *ἐξισοῦν τί τινα* (where *τινί* is neut.) or *ἐξισοῦν τινά τινα* (where *τινί* is masc.); but for *ἐξισοῦν τί τινα* (where *τινί* is masc. or fem.) cf. *El.* 1194 *μητρὶ δ' οὐδὲν ἐξισοῖ* 'she has nothing in common with a

¹ No support can be drawn from Thuc. I. 134 which is itself suspect.

mother,' and the schol. οὐκ ἴσα πράσσει τῇ τῆς μητρὸς ὀνόματι. In *O.T.* 425 read with Wilamowitz ὅσ' ἐξισώσεις σοί τε καὶ τοῖς σοῖς τέκνοις, 'share between yourself and your children'. Thuc. 6. 87 (τὴν ἀσφάλειαν) ἐξισώσαντες τοῖς ἄλλοις, 'sharing the security which the others enjoy,' as explained by Mr. Marchant. But most instructive of all is *O.T.* 1507 μηδ' ἐξισώσης τάσδε τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς, which is the counterpart of the present passage. We might have found with the same meaning ταῖσδε τὰμὰ κακά, but the form chosen by Sophocles is in that place ever so much more effective. For ἐς πόλιν where the dative (πόλει, i.e. πολίταις) is normal cf. *Ai.* 680 ἔς τε τὸν φίλον τοσαυτὴν ὑπουργῶν, *Phil.* 1145 κοινὰν ἤνυσεν ἐς φίλους ἀρωγὰν. The form is chosen here to convey the idea of extension = 'to spread over,' as in *El.* 642 σπεῖρη ματαίαν βάξιν ἐς πᾶσαν πολιν.

A. C. PEARSON.

THUC

THUC
first year
eclipse of
accurately
it himself
εἶναι γίγνε
γεγόμενος

Ginz

176-177, a
passed dia
phase att
time. Ev
of obscur
Eleven an

Ginz

arrived at
his own
1072 digi
ment. G
up to 11
nomical c

Soon
arts to Cl
explicitly
he was a
early sum
certainly
of Pericl
personal
which Th
manner c
another s
afterward
eclipse, it
determin

T. 425 read
veen your-
οἷς ἄλλοις,
Marchant.
οἷς κακοῖς,
ound with
cles is in
ve (πόλει,
Phil. 1145
he idea of
σαν πολιν.
CARSON.

THUCYDIDES ON THE THIRD OF AUGUST, 431 B.C.

THUCYDIDES, II. 28, records an eclipse of the sun in the summer of the first year of the Peloponnesian war. It can be no other than the annular eclipse of the 3rd of August, 431 B.C. He describes the phenomenon so accurately and with so many details that we can hardly doubt that he observed it himself—Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους νομηνία κατὰ σελήνην, ὥσπερ καὶ μόνον δοκεῖ εἶναι γίγνεσθαι δυνατόν, ὁ ἥλιος ἐξέλιπε μετὰ μεσημβρίαν καὶ πάλιν ἀνεπληρώθη, γενόμενος μηνοειδὴς καὶ ἀστέρων τινῶν ἐκφανέντων.

Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*, pp. 24-25, 58, 176-177, and Karte V., gives full particulars of the eclipse. The central zone passed diagonally across the Black Sea from Odessa to Trebizond. The greatest phase attained at Athens almost exactly 10 digits (10.03) at about 5.22 p.m. true time. Every particular agrees with Thucydides' description except the degree of obscuration of the sun's disk. Ten digits are not enough to bring out stars. Eleven are the minimum required (Ginzel, p. 16).

Ginzel (pp. 176-177) quotes two or three recent astronomers who have arrived at a bigger obscuration for Athens. Apart from Stockwell, who had his own peculiar theory of the moon's motion, Hofmann gives the biggest, 10.72 digits. But Hofmann also rejected the stars as a fabulous embellishment. Ginzel believes that the greatest phase at Athens might be screwed up to 11 digits, but not, it would seem, without some pressure on his astronomical conscience.

Sooner than compromise the sincerity of Urania or impute meretricious arts to Clio, let us first scrutinize the historical record. Thucydides does not explicitly define the station whence he observed the eclipse. To assume that he was at Athens is arbitrary. The tone and colour of his narrative of the early summer down to the departure of the Peloponnesian army from Attica certainly suggest that he was there. In the funeral oration put into the mouth of Pericles at the beginning of the winter we may catch the echoes of a personal impression. But between these two points lie three months, during which Thucydides chronicles the operations in Greece in the dry external manner of a distant spectator. (The note about Brasidas in chapter 25 is another story, a touch added on later information and prompted by interest afterwards aroused.) If Athens will not suit Thucydides' account of the eclipse, it is perfectly open to us, and only fair to him, to let his description determine his position, and place him where it will be most accurate.

This method leads us steadily towards the north and north-east, and it is precisely in that direction that we have the best reason to look for Thucydides, if he was away from Athens at that period. His associations with Thrace are attested by himself and are too familiar to need recapitulation. The eclipse of the 3rd of August, 431, would be appreciably greater in Thrace than at Athens. If Thucydides on that day was even no farther north and east than Mount Pangaeum, he would probably, I think, have seen the stars.

But Thucydides himself almost invites us to go a step farther. The next chapter, his very next words, recount how the Athenians made overtures to Nymphodorus of Abdera, appointed him their *proxenos*, and fetched him to Athens, wishing to win through him the alliance of Sitalces, son of Teres, king of the Odrysae, who had married his sister. Nymphodorus was not at Abdera, but at the court of Sitalces, or at all events must have gone thither before sailing; for on his arrival at Athens he concludes the alliance and accepts Athenian citizenship for Sadocus, the king's son. The Athenian envoys would naturally have sought him there, or accompanied him. Thucydides' narrative implies that an understanding with Sitalces was already reached in Thrace.

That Thucydides, connected with a princely family of Thrace and influential *ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τῶν ἡπειρωτῶν*, should have been employed on the mission, is an obvious suggestion, which is supported by his intimate knowledge of, and evident interest in, Sitalces and his family and his realm (II. 29, 67, 95-101, IV. 101). In this particular passage alone in its context can one detect the personal accent of Thucydides through the mask of the annalist, not only in his alacrity to put his fellow countrymen right, out of his own special information, on the confusion between Teres and Tereus, which was probably used to recommend to them the alliance with Teres' son, but also in his triumphant satisfaction at the success of the mission, which enlisted in the forces of Athens, in spite of their estrangement and mutual rivalry, the two most powerful kings of the north, Sitalces and Perdiccas—*οὕτω Σιτάλκης τε ὁ Τήρῳ Θρακῶν βασιλεὺς ξύμμαχος ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Περδίκκας ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρου Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς*.

The Odrysian capital is unknown, but is to be placed in the neighbourhood of Adrianople. There at any rate Thucydides would certainly have seen the stars on the afternoon of the 3rd of August, 431 B.C.

J. A. R. MUNRO.

IN
notes.
such c
ences
Anon.
1.
Tiberi
As
should
2.

G
with ā
culina
his not
δῶματι,
μὴ ἀκρ
Erasmu
i.e., ne
capiend
lauerim
duorum
comes t

3.
Perhaps

4.
ἐνεργεία
obvious
ὄψιν ἀγ
Longinu
στοχάζε
read ἐνα
ταῦτα π
Still, as

NOTES ON THE GREEK RHETORS.

IN the course of reading some of these writers I have made the following notes. Some of the suggestions have very probably been anticipated, and in such cases I can only plead the legal maxim, *superflua non nocent*. The references are to volume and page of Spengel's edition (Lipsiae, 1853-6), and Anon. l. 427 has been cited as Cornutus.

1. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτικοὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς χρῶνται ταῖς ἀναλήψεσι καὶ τῇ παλλογίᾳ. Tiberius, 3. 71.

As these words occur in a section dealing with ἐπανάληψις I think we should read ἐπαναλήψεσι.

2. καὶ τὸ 'Ἡσιόδειον
μηδ' ἀπὸ χυτροπόδων ἀνεπιρρέκτων ἀφελόντα
ἔσθθιν.

Trypho, 3. 194.

Göttling in his edition of Hesiod (1831) wished to transpose ἀνεπιρρέκτων with ἀνεπιξέστων supr. l. 744, and took the prohibition to mean 'quod in culina feceris (i.e. in domus tuae penetralibus) noli aliis cinere prodere.' See his note. As against this we have ὡς μὴ κορῶναι κρώζοιεν ἐν ἀνεπιξέστω τῷ δώματι, Eumath. V. 16, and the above citation by Trypho, who adds, τοῦτεστι, μὴ ἀκρατῇ μηδὲ λίχνον εἶναι. This supports the view of Melanchthon and Erasmus, quoted by Göttling, 'ex ollis non sacrificatis ne capias cibum, i.e., ne edas priusquam dixeris precationem.' M. 'ne ritu pecudum ad cibum capiendum irruamus, sed ita demum edamus, si prius inde primitias dis immolauerimus.' E. Men should wait until grace has been said, and, *exemplum duorum iuniorum Crachittorum secuti*, not 'shriek for goose before their turn comes to be helped.'

3. ἐξ ὧν ἡ φροντις εἰσαγείρεται, Longinus, l. 315. 'ἐγείρεται Bakius.' Perhaps ἐξεγείρεται.

4. ἐνέργειά ἐστι φράσις ὑπ' ὅψιν ἄγουσα τὸ νοούμενον . . . ἔχονται δὲ τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ αἱ τοῦ Ὁμήρου παραβολαί. Trypho, 3. 199. It would seem an obvious correction to write ἐνάργη—and in view of ἔστι δὲ ἐνάργεια λόγος ὑπ' ὅψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον. Cornutus, l. 439, I think it should be made. Cf. Longinus, l. 264; Demetr. Phal. 3. 307. But on the other hand we have δεῖ . . . στοχάζεσθαι . . . ἐνεργείας. Arist. l. 139 (*Rhet.* 3. 10), and though several MSS. read ἐναργείας, yet no such correction is possible ib. 141. λέγω δὲ πρὸ ὁμμάτων ταῦτα ποιεῖν ὅσα ἐνεργοῦντα σημαίνει. οἷον . . . οὐ σημαίνει ἐνέργειαν. κ.τ.λ. Still, as I said, I think Trypho wrote ἐνάργεια.

5. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος αὐξήσεις τῷ μεγέθει τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἐπεργαζόμενος. Menander, 3. 442. I should prefer ἐπεξεργαζόμενος. Cf. ἐπεξεργάζεσθαι τινα τῶν παρέργων εἶναι δοκούντων. Theon, 2. 83.

6. ὁ γοῦν Ἐφορος ἐν τῷ περὶ λέξεως δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπαγορεύοντος λόγου, μὴ τῇ εὐρύθμῳ χρῆσθαι διαλέκτῳ, εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ στίχον εἶρηκεν. Theon, 2. 71.

It can, I fancy, have only been by an oversight that the editor did not write ἐνρύθμῳ, seeing that he has corrected with Finckhiius the εὐρυθμον of the MSS. in τὴν ἔμμετρον καὶ ἔνρυθμον λέξιν, *ib. sup.*

7. εὐτελισμός . . . τὸ πρᾶγμα σμικρυνῶ καὶ εὐτελήσω. Phoebammon, 3. 54. We should write εὐτελίσω. Cf. ἑαυτὸν εὐτελίζοντος, Anon. 3. 141. And κατηντέλισε for ὑμᾶς δὲ κατηντέλησε. Anon. 3. 149. Cf. πράξεις . . . κατευτελίζοντος. Plut. 2. 1097C.

8. τὸ δὲ κεῖσθαι σχῆμα μὲν δηλοῖ . . . δευρὶ τὴν χεῖρα, ἀλλ' οὐ δευρὶ μετήνεγκεν, οὕτως ἦσθητο, οὕτως ἐνεώρα μοι. Longinus, 1. 300. 'ἦσθητο libri ἦστο Bakius.' As I cannot believe that Longinus wrote ἦσθητο, and the context favours the notion of sitting rather than of dress, I should prefer ἦστο.

9. καλλιὰν τὸν πίθηκον. Cocondrius, 3. 233.

Either the scribe or the printer has dropped a letter. Write καλλιὰν.

10. ὀνοματοποιὰ ἐστὶ λέξις ἢ μέρος λόγου πεποιημένον κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἀποτελουμένων ἥχων, ὡς καταχλευασμός ἢ ζέοντος λέβητος ἥχώ. Anon. 3. 210.

It is clear that καταχλευασμός is not the word wanted here, and, I think, equally clear what the right word is. καχλάζω is of fairly frequent occurrence, and L. Sc. cite καχλασμός from Manass. Chron. 229. They also give κάχλασμα, Hesych., where I have failed to find it, but Stephanus quotes it from Eustath. II. ψ., where it is glossed as βράσμα, ζέσις. The scribe was thinking of the familiar χλευασμός, with which the writer deals a little later, and so wrote as above when he should have written κατακαχλασμός.

11. In the same passage, as another instance of onomatopoea, is given κότταβος ἀσπίδων. Members of Dublin University may be inclined to support this by quoting πολλὺς δὲ κοττάβων ἀραγμὸς | Κυπρίδος προσφδὸν | ἀχρεῖ μέλος ἐν δόμοισιν, but χωρὶς ἢ τιμὴ θεῶν, and the κόναβος ἐν πύλαις χαλκοδέτων σακέων of Aeschylus (S.C.T. 160) suggests the true reading, which is supported by πεποιημένα δὲ οἶον κέλαδος, κόναβος, κελαρύζειν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Theon, 2. 81. We have already had some evidence that at this point the mind of the scribe went wandering, and it is a pleasing fancy that just here it reverted to the festival of the previous night, a festival unmarred by 'Dora' or Lord D'Abernon. It might even be suggested that his present aberrations were not wholly unconnected with—but perhaps, 'Twere to consider too curiously, to consider so.'

12. ὁ μὲν (φονεὺς) εἰς ἓνα παρατυχόντα μαιφονεῖ. Aphthonius, 2. 34.

This can hardly be right, and as he has just below τοῦ πάντας μαιφονεῖν, I would either omit εἰς or write εἰς.

13. τοῦ Διὸς βοηθοῦντος τοῖς Τρωσὶ καὶ ἦττον μνηστευομένου τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν. Anon. 3. 119.

The key to this curious saying is to be found in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus, who writes as follows:

Δηριάδη δ' εὔδοντι κατηφέος ὑψόθεν εὐνῆς
 Βάκχῳ πιστὰ φέρουσα παρίστατο θούρις Ἀθήνη,
 γνωτῷ δ' ἐσσομένην ἐτέρην μνηστεύετο νίκην· 26. 1.

The old Latin translation gives *spondebat*, but Bacchus was not present to be promised anything, and I take the meaning to be 'sought to procure victory for,' as in fact she does by urging on the luckless Deriades to fight by a wholly unjustified assertion of his invulnerability. This is also the meaning, though Koehly doubted it, of the later passage (37. 608), where the defeated pancratiast, in imminent peril of suffocation,

νίκην ἀντιπάλου μνηστεύεται ἔμφρονι σιγῇ,
 ἀνέρα νικήσαντα κατηφεί χειρὶ πατάξας,

With these passages to guide us we can, by the alteration of a single letter, set the text right, καὶ ἦτταν κ.τ.λ.

14. οὐ θήσεις δὲ ἐξάπαντος τὰ ἱαμβεῖα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ συνήθη τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ γνώριμα, ἀλλὰ παραδώσεις μᾶλλον. Menander, 3. 413.

Spengel notes 'παραδώσεις P(aris 1874): παρωδήσεις ceteri.' The reading of P does not appear to afford any satisfactory sense, and the notion of parody is quite alien to the context. Now in Hesychius we find *παροδούμενον*: *παροιμιαζόμενον*, and, just below, *παροιμία*: *βιωφελὴς λόγος παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν λεγόμενος*. From this it is possible to infer a verb *παροδέω* = *to mention by the way*, or, *obiter*, which will give exactly the sense required here.

15. διηγῆσεις are divided into *ἀληθεῖς*, i.e. αἱ ἐπὶ τῶν κριτῶν λεγόμεναι, and *πεπλασμένα*, i.e. αἱ καθ' ἑαυτὰς λεγόμεναι, which latter subdivide into *βιωτικά*, *ιστορικά*, *μυθικοί*, *περιπετικά*. Cornutus, l. 435.

The last word may be *περιπατητικά*, but is more probably *περιπατικά*, a form found in Cebes, 13.

16. δεῖ . . . μήτε περιόδοις μακραῖς χρῆσθαι . . . ἀλλὰ περιστέλλειν καὶ μὴ περιουσιάζειν. Cornutus, l. 459.

περιστέλλειν does not give the meaning required, and I suggest that it came by an easy error from *περιουσιάζειν*, the true reading being *συστέλλειν*.

17. Again just below we find ὥσπερ καὶ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου· τὴν γὰρ δευτέραν περιφορὰν ἀπεριγράφως ἐξέτεινε διὰ τὸ πλείονων κατασκευῶν δεῖσθαι. No satisfactory sense can be extracted from *περιφορὰν*, which comes from the same error as *περιστέλλειν* above. It may be noted that the combination *περι-*, excluding the two corrected instances, occurs five times in this section of eighteen lines. I had thought of *καταφορὰν* as *ταῖς καταφοραῖς* occurs earlier in the passage, but I now think that *ἐπιφορὰν* given in the Addenda is right, as *ἐπιφορὰς* occurs just before.

18. τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον μέρος (of the subject) ἀδύνατον περιστοιχεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἄπειρον. Menander, 3. 348.

This may be right, though the word seems otherwise unknown, but he probably wrote *περιστοιχίζεσθαι*.

19. ἡ δὲ περίφρασις . . . πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ περιπεφραγμένα. Alexander, 3. 32. An obvious error of the scribe or printer.

20. προσυναπάντησις ἐστίν, ὅταν δύο ἐξενεγκῶν ὀνόματα πρὸς τὸ τελευταῖον πρότερον τὴν ὑπάντησιν ποιήσῃται, ὥς καὶ τὸ Ὀμηρικόν,

ἔνθ' ἅμα οἰμωγὴ τε καὶ εὐχολὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων.

τὸ γὰρ ὀλλύντων τὸ εὐχόμενον προσαποδέδοται. Alexander, 3. 40.

He uses this verb quite correctly in two earlier passages. αἰτιαλογία δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν προθέντες τι πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι σαφέστερον αὐτὸ τὴν αἰτίαν προσαποδιδώμεν. 3. 17. ἐπάνοδος δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν δύο ὀνόματα διάφορα προτιθέντες μήπω τοῦ νοῦ πέρας ἔχοντος, ἐπανίωμεν ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα καὶ τὸ λείπον τῷ νῷ προσαποδιδώμεν. 3. 30. But here the meaning is that ὀλλύντων which belongs to the second word εὐχολὴ has been brought in before ὀλλυμένων, which belongs to the first word οἰμωγὴ. We should therefore read *προσαποδέδοται*. The error probably arose from taking the first syllable of the opening word of the sentence to be *προσ-* instead of *προ-*.

21. *προσαπόδοσις*. 'A Rhet. figure by which a word is repeated in the second member of a sentence, v. Cic. *Orat.* 3. 52, Quint. 9. 3.' 94. So L. Sc. s.v.

This is supported by Phoebammon, who writes ὁμώνυμον . . . τῇ ἐπιμονῇ ἢ προσεπανάδοσις (an obvious error, due to τῇ ἐπαναδόσει in the previous line), 3. 55, and adds, καὶ ἡ προσαπόδοσις τοιαύτη, ἥς παράδειγμα. τίς ὁ λύσας τὸν χρησμόν; Θεμιστοκλῆς· τίς ὁ βασιλέα καταναυμαχήσας; Θεμιστοκλῆς. 3. 56. So, too, reading *prosapodosis*, Mart. Cap. 5. 175. 'Pr. redditio orationis, id est, cum nomen in postrema parte membri, aut eadem quaecumque pars orationis redditur, ex qua idem membrum coepit: ut si dicas: Publicas tibi calamitates imputare debet respublica.'

The reference to Cic. I have failed to find, but in Quint., as the context shows, the word is the substantive of *προσαποδίδωμι* as used by Alexander, 3. 17, *supr.*: 'Vtrum, quod Rutilius αἰτιολογίαν uocat? . . . Προσαπόδοσιν dicit, quae ut maxime seruetur, sane in pluribus propositis: quia aut singulis statim ratio subiciatur; ut est apud C. Antonium, *Sed neque accusatorem eum metuo, qui sum innocens: neque competitorum vereor, qui sum Antonius: neque consulem spero, qui est Cicero.*' *cet.*

The only other instance I have noted is where *παρεμβολή* is distinguished from *ὑπερβατόν*. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερβατόν ἐν τῇ ἀλλαγῇ τῶν μορίων καὶ τῇ προσαποδόσει τοῦ ἀκολουθοῦντος σχήματος· ἡ δὲ παρεμβολὴ ἰδίαν ἔχει διάνοιαν. Alexander, 3. 39. Here the sense seems to require *προσαποδόσει*.

22. τὸν ἐν προλήψει τιμῆς περιπεσόντα κακοῖς. Choeroboscus, 3. 255. A comparison of this passage with τὸν ἐν προσλήψει μείζονος τιμῆς κακοῖς περιπεσόντα, Anon. 3. 214, shows that here too we should read *προσ-*.

23. We are told, δεῖ τοίνυν συνεστραμμένον εἶναι τὸ προοίμιον, καὶ σπερματ-

ικῶς
Corn
πραγ
πικρὰ
δὲ τῷ
ἀνηπλ
καὶ οἱ
clearl
prope
τραμμ
to be
out a
Clem.
capita
2
T
2
Zonae
μώνυχ
2
βοιδάρ
κυνιδά
T
object
Blayd
πυρρί
dimin
τριηρί
αὐτ m
presen
origina
Cf. 19

ικῶς ἔχειν τὰ πράγματα, καὶ ἀπηλλάχθαι πάσης ἀγωνιστικῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως. Cornutus, l. 433, and that its φράσις should be σπερματικῶς ἔχουσά τινα τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς διηγήσεως, whereas that τῶν πίστεων should be ἐναγώνιος τε καὶ πικρὰ καὶ περιόδοις καὶ κόλοις ἀννομένη. ib. 458. But we are also told, τὴν δὲ τῶν πίστεων ἐρμηνείαν οὔτε ἀφελῇ εἶναι δεῖ, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ διηγῇ, οὔτε ἀνηπλωμένην καὶ σπερματικῶς ἔχουσαν τὰ πράγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεστραμμένην, καὶ οἶον εἰπεῖν κωνοειδῇ, καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἀγωνιστικὴν. ib. 452. This seems clearly inconsistent, and I would suggest that the words have got out of their proper order, and that after ἀνηπλωμένην they should run ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεστραμμένην, καὶ σπερματικῶς ἔχουσαν τὰ πράγματα κ.τ.λ. The meaning I take to be in all cases that the facts are briefly alluded to here and there and not set out at full length. And so in σπερματικῶς πάλιν τὰς ὑποθήκας ἐκθήσομαι. Clem. Al. 308. Cf. ἡ σπερματικὴ τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐπαγωγή. (*sparsim inserta capita*) Ulp. Dem. 9. 6.

24. οἶον ἡ ὄρνις καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια ἰσχυραὶ ἢ στεραιαί. Anon. 3. 172.

The writer may have used this form, but it is simpler to write στερεαί.

25. ἔλλειψις . . . τὸ κατὰ μέσον συγκοπή, οἶον μονόνυχας μώνυχας. Zonaeus, 3. 166, which enables us to correct, κατὰ μέσον, οἶον μονόνυχας μώνυχας. Trypho, 3. 198.

26. μείωσις δὲ ὅταν σμικρύνων τι λέγῃς, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης, οἶον τριηρίτη, βοιδάριον, κυναρίδιον. Cornutus, l. 440. 'πυαρίτη Kayser ex Ar. *Vesp.* 710. κυνιδάριον idem.'

The latter correction may stand, but to the former there are two good objections. In the first place, the word in Ar. *l.c.* according to Dindorf (1876), Blaydes (1886, 1893), Graves (1894), and the Oxford text (1900), is not πυαρίτη but πυριάτη; and in the second place neither one nor the other is a diminutive. The original word must have been a diminutive of τριήρης, e.g. τριηρίδιον, and the copyist wrote the more familiar one in a momentary lapse *aut mentis aut calami*, οἶά τε πολλὰ . . . πέλονται with such persons, as the present writer has good reason to know. (*Exempli gratia*, on re-reading my original draft I found that I had written πεπλαγμέναι for πεπλασμέναι. Cf. 19 *supr.*)

HERBERT W. GREENE.

MVLIER ARIES, AND OTHER CRUCES IN CATVLLVS.

THIS instalment of suggestions is put forward with all the diffidence one is bound to feel after an examination of the great body of the manuscripts. No great writer's text has hung upon a more slender thread of evidence. Larger matters than verbal emendation are touched upon in the discussion of poem LXVIII. My theory of how our texts became dislocated (and more than half of the extant manuscripts present an order quite different from that of GOR), and some new light I hope to throw upon the form and meaning of the Peleus and Thetis, must be withheld until a later occasion.

XXV. 4:

idemque, Thalle, turbida rapacior procella,
cum diua † mulier aries † ostendit oscitantes,
remitte pallium mihi meum quod inuolasti,
sudariumque Saetabum catagraphosque Thynos. . . .
quae nunc tuis ab unguibus reglutina. . . .

mulier Ω

aries. O Ven. *alios* al. *aves* uel *aries*. G.

aves al. *aries* uel *alios*. R.

aves. BA. *alios*. e.g. Palermitanus. *ostendet*. OG₁.

No emendation can be said to hold the field. *munerarios* is explicitly declared by Quintilian (VIII. 3. 34) to be a word first used by Augustus. All other proposals recorded by Ellis in either edition are either far from the *ductus literarum* or fail to scan.

Of the variants *aries*, *aves*, *alios*, while none scans, the first alone makes nonsense and could have no construction. As this is given alone in O (and in Ven., which is nearly related to R), it appears to be the text of the archetype; from it *aves* arises. *alios* is either from a further misreading *alies* or a gloss explaining *oscitantes*; *arios* is found only in the margin of L, and cannot have stood in V.

The type of rapacity was the kite; and here Thallus is figured as swooping (*inuolasti*) with talons (*unguibus*) and worse than a storm from the sky. Such passages as Cicero *Epist. ad Q. Fr.* I. 2. 6: *Licinium plagiarium cum suo pullo miluino tributa exigere*, or Petronius 75. 6, where Trimalchio turns upon Fortunata with 'milua,' suggest that *mulier* in our context is a corruption of the vocative *milue*, applied to Thallus. (Cf. also Plautus *Pseud.* III. 2. 63; *Poen.* V. 5. 13. A. Palmer has proposed here *diua miluorum aves* . . . , but we

have seen the probability that *aves* is not a true reading, and surely *alias* would be a necessary addition for the sense.)

Thallus is under the special protection of some goddess, presumably Lauerna or Fortuna of thieves, unless a kite-headed goddess of Egypt be imagined. She points out a nodding slave or owner, and he swoops like a kite upon small birds. Where would Catullus drop his cloak, towels, and note-book together? Not at dinner so probably as at exercise: in *campus et areae* (Horace *C. I. 9. 18*). In *areae* the small birds are collected by the bird-catcher (Plautus *Asin. I. 3. 64, 67*: and cf. Cicero *Lc.*). The twofold line of approach suggests that *aries* in our context is a corruption of *areis*. The letters *e* and *i* are confused in the very next word, *ostendit* (-et, OG₁).

The presence of *aves* and of *alios* as variants is now explicable alternatively as due to the idea of the *miluus*. The scansion *milūus*, *milūo* survived down to Horace (*Epist. I. 16. 51*; *Epod. 16. 32*).

I propose, then, to read:

idemque, Thalle, turbida rapacior procella,
cum diua, milue, areis ostendit oscitantes . . .

The general use of *oscitantes* without a noun is defended by XII. 3: *tollis lintea neglegentiorum*.

XXIX. 20-24:

nunc Galliae timet(ur) et Britanniae.
quid hunc Lamum fouetis? aut quid hic potest
nisi uncta deuorare patrimonia?
eone nomine urbis † op(p)ulentissime †
socer generque, perdidistis omnia.

21. Lamum. Slater.

malum. Ω.

hinc Ω.

The last verse was surely written to stand alone as a statement. It is quoted alone at *Catalepton 3. 6*:

ut ille uersus usquequaque pertinet:
'gener socerque, perdidistis omnia.'

If the verb of v. 23 is lost and v. 23 was a question by itself, then the statement in v. 24 had as much force as belongs to v. 10—after the series of questions preceding; and the sting in the tail is sharper. All restorations of v. 23 hitherto proposed weaken the sting of v. 24 by including it within the question *eone nomine* . . . ?

Caesar remains at the ends of the earth, only that his creatures like Mamurra may gorge themselves. Mamurra is to devour even Gaul and Britain, the prizes of the *imperator unicus*. Caesar and Pompey are nurturing not a serpent but an ogre, who will eventually copsume themselves.

I would explain *oppulentissime* as a rearrangement of the letters *éssulentôppimi*, where an inversion of words was marked by one scribe and an inversion of syllables understood by the next.

The false spellings *oppimi* for *optimi* and *essulent* for *ecsulent* need no explanation. I would read:

eone nomine urbis optimi ecsulent?
socer generque, perdidistis omnia.

This is a poem of subtle echoes, and verses 11 and 12 are recalled:

eone nomine, imperator unice,
fuisti in ultima occidentis insula . . .

Catullus might pretend that he meant no more by vv. 23 and 24 than that Caesar and Pompey have *lost* all, as *aleones* playing with Mamurra, and that Caesar and his followers at the ends of the earth are the *urbis optimi* in exile. In this sense his *iambi* were almost *innerentes* (LIV. 7). But he of course actually meant that they have *ruined* civic Rome and would allow all its best spirits to be driven into exile for the enrichment of a Mamurra. The *imperator unicus* and the *urbis optimi* are ironically contrasted; it is to the sting in the former phrase that he makes reference in LIV. 7.

XI. 9-12:

siue trans altas gradietur Alpes, | Caesaris uisens monimenta magni,
Gallicum Rhenum † horribilesque † ultimosque Britannos.

horribiles: R Ven. BLA¹, *multi*.

horribilesque: GO.

That the *-que* stood in V appears certain. It appears at least probable, however, that it was an addition so written that the parent MS. of R and G threw doubt upon it. If the *-que* is a fragment of the true text, the most plausible correction is *horribilem sequi* (Housman). But V gave *bonisque malisque* for *bonis malisque* at XV. 10; and here there is the double chance that the *-que* is either a similar mistake due to the *-que* following, or a deliberate addition (unsatisfying, it is true) to mend the broken metre.

On the thesis that *horribilesultimosque* may have been a stage in the tradition, and that this arose from *horribilezesultimosque*, I venture to propose:

Gallicum Rhenum horribilem ecsul ultimosque Britannos.

The verse is not rougher than vv. 19, 20, or XXVI. 5; and the horrors pile up well to their climax. I should quote Petronius *Bell. Civil.* 160-162, where Caesar is made to say of himself: *pulsus ab urbe mea dum Rhenum sanguine tinguo, dum Gallos iterum Capitolia nostra petentes Alpibus excludo, uincendo certior exul*. Also the verses discussed above: XXIX. 12 and 23.

I. 8:

quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli,
qualecumque † quod patrona uirgo †
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.

Catullus dedicates his book to Cornelius, and no second dedication to the Muse is tolerable within the limits of this poem. Bergk's *patron(e)i ut ergo*

seems t
through
cf. VII.

(a)
verse 9
quidem
records
it in its

(b)
G recor
text of
1906) an
to misp
filled.

(TI
ELL
opibus
as genit
opibus
Ovid w
multa
qualiscu

I p
we have
LX

No
bridegr
though
passage
brachia
pr
LV

If

seems to me absolutely certain. Cornelius bears *omne aenum* on his back; through him will Catullus be *perennis*. For *patronei* corrupted to *patrona* cf. VII. 9, *basiei*, *basia*; LXVIII. 155. *satis* Ω, for *seit*is.

(a) If *quod* were sound, there could be but one way of further mending verse 9, *qualecumque*, *quod* <est>; and that was read by Avantius. That *quidem* stood in V as a variant for *quod* is hardly conceivable; for only R records it in the margin, and only D, suspect for many other supplements, puts it in its text.

(b) But there is a real variant from V, which had been overlooked. G records *mei* as a variant in V. for *libelli*; and *mei* stands for *libelli* in the text of *Vaticanus* 1630 (= Ellis's V, a MS of the B *gens* which I collated in 1906) and of La². We have, then, a supplemental word, of sufficient authority to misplace another which scans and construes, and a gap before *patronei* to be filled. This may be held to point to:

quod

qualecumque mei, patronei ut ergo. . .

(This proposal appears as mine in the notes to the Loeb edition.)

Ellis quoted Censorinus *de die natali* I: *quodcumque hoc libri est, meis opibus comparatum . . . tibi misi*. I cannot join *mei* to *libelli*, but take it as genitive of the personal pronoun. *qualecumque mei* would correspond to *meis opibus comparatum*: 'this expression of myself imperfect though it be'. So Ovid with less humility in the *envoi* to *Amores* I. (xv. 42): *uiuam parsque mei multa superstes erit*. For a somewhat similar phrase cf. Propertius III. 21. 16: *qualiscumque mihi, tuque, puella, uale*.

quare habe tibi quicquid hoc libelli,

qualecumque mei, patronei ut ergo

plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.

I prefer this reading to that of Avantius; and unless one of them be true we have no assistance from the archetype.

LXVI. 15:

estne nouis nuptis odio Venus? atque † parentum †

frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis . . .

No one will defend *parentum*, which has clearly replaced a word for the bridegroom, whose *gaudia* alone are in question (LXI. 109). But *maritum*, though possible, is not palaeographically convincing. On the analogy of passages such as Propertius *El.* IV. 3. 11, 12: *noctis, cum rudis urguenti brachia uicta dedi*, and in view of *uestigia rixae* here (13), I suggest *prentum*.

LV. 17:

nunc te lacteolae tenent puellae?

si linguam clauso † tenens † in ore,

fructus proicies amoris omnes.

If this were a carelessly written poem, we might tolerate *tenes* in v. 18

after *tenent* in v. 17. But the elaborate arrangement and balance of the poem as restored by Froehlich precludes such carelessness. [It falls into three parts, numerically arranged thus: (a) 2 | 3. 3. 4 || (b) 2 | 4. 3. 3 || (c) 2 | 1. 2. 1. 2. The first group of 3 in (a) is marked by the *te, te, te* of vv. 3-5; the group of 4 in (b) by the *non, non, non, non* of vv. 1a-4a, and the fall of the other divisions in (b) by the vocatives *amice, Cameri, amice*, in the last verse of each group. Again, the spondaic second feet are equal in number to the dactylic, and are so distributed that the proportion is 8 : 4 in (a) and 4 : 8 in (b), while in (c) they are alternate.]

I propose *teres* (if *si* stands) ; or, if *sic* be accepted from Birt, *terens*.

LXVIII. (b):

(1) *Structure of the Poem*.—The large lines are clear. LXVIII. (a), vv. 1-40, is a fragment of a separate poem addressed to 'Mallius' not 'Allius.' In it the poet excuses himself from writing such a poem as Mallius in his grief has invited, and that on the ground of his own grief at his brother's death. In vv. 41-160 we have just such a poem as Catullus would have written to Mallius, if he had been in the mood (and if he had had his books with him, 33-40). It contains passages jocular and erotic and a myth *ueterum dulci scriptorum carmine* (7). He can detach himself from his grief to amuse a friend, but comes back to it at the incidental mention of Troy in v. 88. The period of LXVIII. (b) is thus a little later than that of LXVIII. (a).

The separate poem LXVIII. (b) (vv. 41 to 160) has a prologue and epilogue chiefly about 'Allius'—vv. 41-50 (A) and 149-160 (B); a central myth, vv. 73-130, with a passage on Troy interpolated by the author (vv. 89-104); and before and after the myth an autobiographical passage chiefly about Catullus's love for his mistress—vv. 51-72 (C) and 131-148 (D).

(A) The prologue (41-50) has 4+6 verses (v. 47 lost). It would have balanced the epilogue, if two verses are granted to have been lost at the beginning. Before v. 41 there has undoubtedly been lost at least the conclusion of the preceding poem LXVIII. (a).

(B) The epilogue (149-160) is complete in 12 verses, arranged 6+6.

(C) has 22 verses, arranged as 6+6+10 (7+3).

(D) has 18 verses, arranged as 10 (7+3)+2+6.

Between vv. 141 and 142 an even number of verses has been lost; if these were *four* in number, (D) would balance (C).

The myth itself is composed as follows: It begins (73-86) with 14 verses, arranged as 4+2, + $\overbrace{8}^{6+2}$. It ends (117-130) with 14 verses, arranged as 2, +6+4, +2. The intervening passage, as it stands, appears to divide at v. 100 into sections of 14 and 16 verses (87-100 and 101-116), arranged as 4, +6+4 and 4, +6+8. Once admit, however, the possibility that the interpolated verses on the brother's death at Troy are outside the original scheme, we notice that vv. 101-104 are merely an expansion of vv. 87, 88, contrived to

bring us back to our subject after the personal digression. The original scheme then seems to have included only vv. 87, 88 and 105-116, or another group of 14 verses, arranged as 2, + 4 + 8 (cf. 73-86). Or alternatively vv. 87-90 belong to an original scheme 14 + 16 + 14.

I submit that there is a strong probability that *two* verses of this poem have been lost before v. 41 and four verses after v. 141. I postulate that one whole *page* at least of the archetype had perished before v. 41. (On another occasion I hope to put forward my theory as to the pagination and arrangement of this archetype.) For my view of the formal schemes of composition inherited by the Roman elegists from Callimachus and others, I refer readers to my article on Propertius in the *Classical Quarterly* for April, 1918.

Whether the interpolated verses on Troy and his brother's death were 14 or 16 in number, they break the formal scheme proposed. They are brought in at the very heart of the poem and the scheme calls attention to them. Particular attention is called to certain of the verses because they are repeated from LXVIII. (a). The brother's death is shown to be an obsession. But I now further submit that the modern reader has an advantage here over 'Allius,' unless he also had read LXVIII. (a). What then if he was actually the same person as 'Mallius'? What if this actually is the poem he failed to write for 'Mallius' a short while before?

The scheme of LXVIII. (a) 1-40 is 14 + 12 + 14 to the break. This would not balance any part of LXVIII. (b), which is thus again shown to be a separate poem.

(2) *Prologue and Epilogue, (A) and (B).*—The prologue is a ludicrous piece of exaggeration. Catullus's poem is to give 'Allius' ever-increasing fame during his lifetime (v. 47 to this effect has however unkindly perished) and compound interest after death (48). But surely there is a pun on *allium*. His name must not be allowed to grow mouldy (151) at the touch of *haec atque illa dies*, atque alia atque alia. The *sublimis aranea* is not to spin round his deserted name (50). I catch a suggestion of strings of *allium* hanging from an outhouse roof. On 152 follows the reference to the coarse fruits of the earth offered of old to Themis. (Compare Varro *apud Non.* 201. 9: *ataui nostri, cum alium ac caepe eorum uerba olerent, tamen optime animati erant.*)

I submit that this punning, and the nature of the services of Allius which Catullus describes in vv. 69 and 156, render it likely that 'Allius' is a pseudonym. The name is first introduced with an *m* before it: *qua m(e) Allius* (41). I regard 'Mallius' as the man intended (see above [1]).

vv. 125-158 I read thus: *seitis felices et tu simul et tua uita, | et domus in qua <una> lusimus et domina, | et qui principio nobis terram dedit Auster, | a quo sunt primo omnia nata bona . . .*

157. aufert. codd.

For *una* lost after *qua* cf. v. 69 *communes*. My proposal *Auster*, recorded in the Loeb text, I support as follows:

'Allius' came to Catullus (64) as a favouring breeze, *lenius aspirans*, when he was almost shipwrecked. (Incidentally this is the figure used by Mallius in his appeal to Catullus, v. 3.) He gave him space to manoeuvre in (*campum*, 67). From Cicero *ad Fam.* XVI. 9. *austro lenissimo, caelo sereno, nocte illa et die postero in Italiam ad Hydruntem ludibundi peruenimus*, one infers that Auster though stormy was on occasion a favourable wind with which to make Italy from Greece. Compare an almost figurative use in *ad Att.* XVI. 7. 5: *ego uero austro gratias miras qui me a tanta infamia auerterit*. 'Allius' brought Catullus to land, *terram dedit*; and then *patefecit campum* (67). *Auster* is figurative; 'the ill wind that blew me good and brought my ship home.' For a similar figure cf. *nobis Aquilo, Cynthia, uentus erit* (Propertius II. 5. 4.).

(3) vv. 51-72.—I venture to think that this passage would be greatly improved by a transposition of stanzas (see above [1]). The simile of the mountain brook (vv. 57-62) should follow v. 72. Catullus's floods of tears (56) cannot be properly likened to a brook which relieves and *cools* (see vv. 53, 54) the traveller and the parched lands and passes through a populous city. Nor can this figure be harmonized with vv. 63-65 as a simile for Allius's service, whereas vv. 63-65 would follow easily upon v. 56. On the other hand, the figure of the mountain brook is very beautiful after 72, if applied to the *molli candida diua pede* descending from her height to gleam and rustle (*arguta solea*) upon the worn threshold (71) of the town house (*densi populi*) and refresh the parched wanderer within.

(4) vv. 117, 118:

sed tuus altus amor barathro fuit altior illo,
qui † tuum domitum † ferre iugum docuit.

I retract the suggestion recorded against me in the Loeb text and now argue as follows. Is the final section (117-130) of the Laodamia myth to bring no reference to the most important detail of the myth from a lover's point of view? *illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros | non potuit caecis immemor esse locis, | sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis | Thessalis antiquam uenerat umbra domum*: Propertius *Cynthia* XX. (XIX.) 7-10. 'Si comes exstincti manes sequerere mariti, | esset dux facti Laodamia tui': Ovid *P.* 3. 1. 109.

Verses 117, 118 and 129, 130 ought to refer to the union of the lovers after death; and the lack of such reference in the text should guide our correction of v. 118. Laodamia's love was deeper than the abyss of Hercules' delving; it pierced through to Hades itself. Protesilaus untamed in the tomb was tamed by that love of hers,

qui tumulo indomitum ferre iugum docuit.

Here *loī-* was lost before *doī-*, and *tumu-* became *tuum*. The late-born grandchild of the aged (119) is like a return from the grave, but gives less joy than did he to her.

O. L. RICHMOND.

THE UNIVERSITY, EDINBURGH.

IT
εὐγενής
gener-is
dur-man
chen W
for the
Bechte
this we
worth v
W
are s-st
analyse
other e

It
-ης is a
ing cas

Γυ
τη
ἀρ
ῆμ

ὀρ
πε

με
ἀα
με
ἀσ

τρ

¹ W. S.
p. 254, n
ablaut is
adjective
s-stem.
ἀγκυλο-χ
to those

THE GREEK ADJECTIVES ENDING IN -ης.

It is generally assumed that every adjective ending in -ης is an s-stem like *εὐγενής* (gen. *εὐγενοῦς* from *εὐγενέ(σ)-ος*; cf. *γένος* gen. *γένε(σ)-ος*, Lat. *genus gener-is*, Skr. *janas janas-as*) or *δυσμενής* (: *μένος*; cf. Skr. *dur-manās* gen. *dur-manas-as*). Solmsen, for instance, does not hesitate (*Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung* 16) to regard *ὀμ-ηγερός* (*πολυ-ηγερός*, *θυμ-ηγερός*) as evidence for the s-stem *geres* which he wishes to find in *ἀγοστός* (*ἀγο(ρ)σ-τός*), and Bechtel (*Lexilogus* 274) infers a stem *παρεσ-* from *ὑπερπαγής*. The result of this well-nigh universal belief¹ has been that hardly anybody has thought it worth while to examine these words carefully.

While it may be admitted that a large number of adjectives ending in -ης are s-stems, the following facts may serve to show how impossible it is to analyse them all in that way, and how easily many of them lend themselves to other explanations.

It does not seem to have been noticed how often an adjective ending in -ης is accompanied by an Aorist Passive in -ῆναι. I have observed the following cases of this parallelism:

ἑνναιμανής (Hom.): *μανῆναι*.

τηλεφανής (Hom.): *φανῆναι*.

ἀρισφαλής (Hom.): *σφαλῆναι*.

ἡμιδαής 'half-burnt' (Hom.). The corresponding Aorist occurs only in

Hesychius: *ἐκδαῖν* · *ἐκκαυθῆναι* (emended by Ahrens).

ὀρθοδαής (Aesch.): *ἐδάην* (Hom.).

περικαής Hippocr. *Epidem.* VI. 14 (V. 274 Littré), cf. *πυρκαής* Hippocr.

Epidem. VI. 2, 10 (V. 282 Littré): *ἐκάην*.

μεσσοπαγής (Hom.): *παγῆναι*.

*ἀαγής*² 'unbreakable' (Hom. λ 575): (*Ἔαγῆναι* (Hom.). Aor. of *ἄγνυμι*.

μελοτυπής (Aesch.): *ἐτύπην* (Hom.).

ἀσαπέως Hippocr. *περὶ διαίτης* ὀξέων 16 (I. 116, 20 Kühlewein): *ἐσάπην* (Hom.).

τριχορρυνής (Aesch. fr. 275): *ρύνῆναι* (Aesch. etc.).

¹ W. Schulze's observation (*Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that *φειδῶ* : *ἀφειδής* is a case of *elō* ablaut is one of the rare admissions that an adjective ending in -ης can be anything but an s-stem. Another is Wackernagel's analysis of *ἀγκυλο-χῆλης*. I return later to these views and to those of Bechtel (on *δυναής*).

² The second α is probably short, although *ἀαγής* stands at the end of a hexameter in λ 575, and W. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, 436) thinks that *ἀαγής* might be defended. The line λ 575 is metrically exceptional, and ends in οοο (on such lines see Schulze l. c.), Sophocles, who has *κνυματοῦγής*, *Oed. Col.* 1243, did not know that.

- εὐσταλής (Aesch. Soph. Thuc.): σταλῆναι (Pind. etc.).
 παμμιγής (Aesch.): ἐμίγην (Hom.).
 αἱμορραγής (Soph.): ἐρράγην (Soph. etc.).
 εὐρραφής (Hom.): ῥαφῆναι (Eur. etc.).
 νεοζυγής (Aesch.): ζυγῆναι (Pind. Trag.).
 ἀκαρής¹ 'indivisible' (ἐν ἀκαρεῖ 'in an instant') (Aristoph. etc.): καρῆναι (κεῖρω).
 αἰμοσταγής (Aesch.): ἐστάγην (this Aorist however is very late).
 παλινστραφής (Soph. Ἰχν. 112): στραφῆναι.
 εὐτραφής² (Trag. Hippocr. Plato.): τραφῆναι (τρέφω).
 ἑτεροκλινής (Hippocr. Μοχλ. 14; II. 253, 18 Kühlewein): κλινῆναι.
 μιλτηλιφής (Hdt.): ἄλιφῆναι (Plato).
 δημορριφής (Aesch.): ῥιφῆναι (Plato etc.).
 ἐπιχαρής (Aesch.): ἐχάρην, κεχαρηώς.
 νεοσφαγής (Soph.): σφαγῆναι (Trag. etc.).
 φρενοπληγής (Aesch.): πληγῆναι (Hom.).
 καταπλαγής (Polyb.): καταπλαγῆναι (Trag. etc.).
 ψευδαγγελής (Aristoph. Av. 1340): ἀγγελῆναι (first in Euripides, *I.T.* 932).
 κατασκαφής (Soph.): ἐσκάφην (Trag.).
 πολυβαφής (Aesch.): ἐβάφην (Plato, Hippocr.).
 ὀστρειογραφής MamerCUS (Bergk, *P.L.G.* p. 501): γραφῆναι.
 ἀτριβής (Thuc.): τριβῆναι (Aristoph. etc.).
 εὐφυνής (Hom.): ἐφύνη (found as early as Hippocrates).
 ἡμιβραχής, ἐλαιοβραχής, εὐβραχής and other words in which -βραχής alternates with -βρεχής are given by Lobeck, *Phryn.* 577. They are all late. The forms in -βραχής may be compared with ἐβράχην, those in -βρεχής with ἐβρέχην. These Aorists of βρέχω are discussed by Solmsen (*Glotta* II. 313).
 εἰληθερής (or ἐλιθερής) occurs in Hippocr. περὶ νοούσων II. 27 (VII. 44 Littré): τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν φύλλων εἰληθερές 'la préparation susdite des feuilles chaude' (Littré) and again in II. 30 (VII. 48 Littré). Cf. ἐλιθερές, τὸ ὡς ἀπὸ ἡλίου θερμόν Galen Gloss. Perhaps θερῶ Hom. *Od.* 17, 23 (subjunct. of ἐθέρην) should be compared.

In my opinion this parallelism arises from the fact that many of these adjectives are not s-stems but ē-stems (like the Fifth Declension in Latin). Γυναιμανής contains the same stem μανη- as ἐ-μάνη-ν.

The existence of ē-stems in Greek was first asserted by Bechtel (*Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 1886, pp. 378-381; cf. *Ion. Inschriften* 66*). He pointed especially to the declension Ἀρης acc. Ἀρην gen. Ἀρεω (Archi-

¹ The connexion of ἀκαρής with κείρω was perceived by the ancients (see Solmsen, *Beiträge zur griech. Wortforschung*, p. 162 footnote).

² Τραφῆναι is first found in Tragedy. Homer has only ἐτραφον, which he uses in a passive

sense, v. Solmsen, *Glotta* II. 311 (after Ph. Buttmann). With this fact the Homeric preference for -τρεφής (ἀνεμο-τρεφής and many others) may be connected.

lochus etc., and the one by the misinter forms— accorda acquire

By adjectiv arising his book and the stem of not got that in ὑπερπαγ ē-stems

It i have be Aorist P analogic analogic assuming proved b from a d Aorist fo and ἐκπλ πληγής.

πλαγῆναι their late choice of and verb -βρεχής (tion of th

For before us the other may be o

Besid δοριμανής, (Aristoph. an adject might com

lochus fragm. 48), to the Boeotian proper names in -ει, Ἀθανίκει, Ἀκύλλει, etc., and to the Ionic genitive forms ἱέρεω and μύκεω. He supposed that on the one hand the old Greek \bar{e} -stems had become confused with and absorbed by the $\bar{e}u$ -stems (ἱερής by ἱερέυς, Τύδης by Τύδευς, etc.), while, on the other, misinterpretation of the existing forms of \bar{e} -stems gave rise to new analogical forms—e.g., ζαής (an s -stem according to Bechtel) acquired the acc. ζαήν in accordance with the proportion Ἀρης Ἀρην and similarly many other s -stems acquired accusatives in -ην.

By 1908 Bechtel had apparently come to perceive that among the adjectives in -ής some were \bar{e} -stems originally, and not merely pseudo \bar{e} -stems arising from analogy. He perceived this in the case of the words in -αής. In his book on *Vowel Contraction in Homer* (p. 56) he notes that the acc. ζαήν and the gen. δυσαήων contain the original η - of the stem, which is also the stem of ἀη-μ. That his perception of the truth about the adjectives in -ής had not got beyond this stage even in 1914 is proved by the already mentioned fact that in his *Lexilogus zu Homer* (published in that year) he infers from ὑπερπαγής a stem παγασ-, and by his latest (pre-war) pronouncement on \bar{e} -stems (*Lexilogus*, p. 59).

It is clear that there was a close relationship, whatever its origin may have been, between a number of adjectives in -ής and the corresponding Aorist Passive forms. This relationship gave rise, moreover, to a number of analogical formations. For instance, ψευδαγγελής cannot be anything but an analogical formation from ἀγγελῆναι, since ἀγγελῆναι does not give ground for assuming an old \bar{e} -stem ἀγγελη-, being itself a recent analogical formation, as is proved by the fact that it is one of the only two second Aorist Passive forms from a denominative verb (the other being ἀλλαγῆναι). This influence of the Aorist forms on the adjectives at a late date is further proved by καταπλαγής and ἐκπλαγής. In early Greek, where we find ἐπλήγην, we also find φρενοπληγής. Καταπλαγής and ἐκπλαγής betray their analogical origin from πλαγῆναι in four ways: (1) by their agreement with it in the short a ; (2) by their late occurrence (not before Polybius); (3) by the coincidence in the choice of preposition with ἐκπλαγῆναι and καταπλαγῆναι; (4) by their passive and verbal meaning. The behaviour of the words in -τρεφής (-τραφής) and -βρεχής (-βραχής)—see above—must also be due to this analogical accommodation of the adjective to the Aorist form.

For the purpose of estimating whether in an individual case we have before us an analogical formation or a real original \bar{e} -stem the following list of the other words containing the same end-element as those mentioned above may be of value:

Besides γυναιμανής (Hom.) there are θεομανής, φρενομανής, ἵππομανής, δοριμανής, θυρσομανής (all occurring in Tragedy), ἡλιομανής, χορομανής (Aristoph.). All of these have a noun as first element. Ἀκρομανής (Hdt.) has an adjective, and ἐμμανής (Aesch.) a preposition (or adverb). Any of these might contain an old \bar{e} -stem noun *μᾰνη-ς (formed like Lat. *fides*).

Besides *τηλεφανής* (Hom.) there are only words beginning with a preposition (or adverb): *ἀφανής* (Sappho 68 etc.), *ἐμφανής* (Pind. etc.), *ἐπιφανής* (Pind.), *διαφανής*, *καταφανής* (Aristoph.), *προφανής* (Hippocr. Thuc. etc.), *συμφανής* (Aristotle, Polyb. etc.). The existence of *ἐπιφανήναι*, *διαφανήναι*, etc., suggests an analogical origin for most of these words.

Besides *ἄρισφαλής* (Hom.) there are *ἀσφαλής* (Hom. etc.), *ἐπισφαλής* (Plato etc.), *δομοσφαλής* (Aesch.), *ἀκροσφαλής* (Polyb.).

Besides *ἡμιδαής* 'half-burnt' (Hom.), we have *θεσπιδαής* (Hom.).

Besides *ὀρθοδαής* (Aesch.) we have *αὐτοδαής* and *ἀδαής* (Soph. etc.).

Besides *μεσσοπαγής* we have *πρωτοπαγής* (Hom.), *δορπαγής* (Aesch.), *γομφοπαγής* (Aristoph.), *ἀπαγής* (πῖλος) (Hdt.).

Besides *τριχορρυνής* (Aesch.) we have *γονορρυνής* LXX. cf. *πτερορρυνεῖν* (Aristoph.), *τριχορρυνεῖν* *id.* and (with a preposition) *καταρρυνής* (Soph.).

Besides *παμμιγής* we have *πολυμιγής*, *συμμιγής* (Aesch.), *ἀμμιγής* (Plato etc.).

Besides *αἰμορραγής* we have *διχορραγής*, *ψυχορραγής* (Eur.) *πυρορραγής* (Aristoph.) *ἄρραγής* (Hippocr.).

Besides *ἐνρραφής* we have *λινορραφής* (Aesch.).

Besides *αἰμοσταγής* we have *δειματοσταγής* (Aesch.), *νεκταροσταγής* (Com.).

Besides *παλινστραφής* we have *ἀστραφής* and *ἀμφιστραφής*. *Παλινστραφής* is no doubt coined by Sophocles, the combination *-νστρ-* being unheard of in a genuine old Greek word.

Besides *ἐτεροκλινής* we have *κατακλινής* (Hippocr.), *συγκλινής* (Aesch fr. 84), *ἀκλινής* (LXX.).

Besides *μυλτηλιφής* we have *διηλιφής* (Soph.¹).

Besides *δημορριφής* we have *πετρορριφής* (Eur.), *χαμαιριφής* (Eur. *Bacch.* 1111). This last is on a par with *παλινστραφής*, the first element being not a bare stem but a complete word.

Besides *ἐπιχαρής* we have *περιχαρής* (Soph. Ar. etc.), *ὑπερχαρής* (Polyb.).

Besides *νεοσφαγής* we have *αὐτοσφαγής* (Eur.).

Besides *πολυβαφής* we have *κροκοβαφής* (Aesch.), *αἰμοβαφής* (Soph.).

Besides *ἀτριβής* we have *νεοτριβής* (Pseudo-Phocyl. 155), *οἰκοτριβής* (Critias 2. 14, *Bgk.*), *παλιντριβής* (Soph.), *ἐντριβής* (Soph.).

Besides *εὐφυής* we find *προσφυής* (Hom.), *ἐμφυής* (Pind.), *διφυής* (Soph.), *ἀφυής* (Soph.), *ἐλαιοφυής*, *ὀδοντοφυής*, *λεοντοφυής* (Eur.), *ὑπερφυής* (Aristoph. etc.), *στενοφυής* (Alexis etc.).

It will scarcely be maintained that in all these cases of parallelism with the Aorist Passive we are dealing with analogical formations from the Aorist. There seems therefore to be no escape from the conclusion that the parallelism affords proof of the existence of Greek *ē*-stem nouns.

I have reserved for special consideration the word *νεαλής* 'newly caught' with its congeners *δουριαλής* and the adverb *εὐαλῶς*, which Hesychius trans-

¹ Herodian, *περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, II. p. 473 (Lentz), quotes *ὑπηλιφής* and *ἀνπηλιφής*. Eustathius,

Od. 1561, says: *ἀνηλιφής* ναὺς ἢ μὴ ἀλιφεῖσα πίσση, *καὶ πωσαλιφής*, ἢ πεπισσωμένη.

lates into
Philology

viz., ἀλῶ

Wa

ū = Skr.

-γιής me

Moreover

It is

uidere.

stem of I

κακοφρα

this wou

girdēu 'y

ἀνότητον,

stem as

have me

connect

Lexilogus

Brug

(*Grundris*

second el

sion wor

ē-stems, c

add *sub-δ*

νεαλής 'y

Wörterbuch

tion of -

decl.) in

must ha

ē-stems.

Some

Aorist Pa

the *ē* of

Schulze, c

ἀνεπιδεής

can be ap

στερής ἢ

(Hippocr.

ἀρδη-θμός.

As ha

note 4) th

i.e. it is a

with *πειθα*

πολυηχής

lates into *εὐχερῶς θηρώμενος*. (These three words are combined by Baunack, *Philologus* 73, 36 f.) Here also we recognise a relation to a Passive Aorist, viz., *ἀλῶναι*. It is a case of *ē/ō* ablaut: *ἀλλη- : ἀλω-*.

Wackernagel (*Dehnungsgesetz* 4) has shown that *ὕγις* is composed of *ύ = Skr. su-* 'well' and the root of *βίος* 'life.' It is now possible to analyse *-γις* more exactly: *-γις* stands to *βιῶναι* as *-αλής* (in *νεαλής*) to *ἀλῶναι*. Moreover *ὕγιη-ρός* has preserved its original *η*.

It is tempting to recognise in *ἀιδής*—(1) unseen, (2) blind—the *ē*-stem of *uidere*. *Ἀτενής* (cf. *ἐκτενής ἀλιτενής βυρσοτενής σχοινοτενής*) may contain the stem of Lat. *tenere*. *Ἀφραδής* (cf. *ἀριφραδής δολοφραδής πολυφραδής εὐφραδής κακοφραδής περιφραδής*) may contain the same stem as Lith. *girdē-ti* 'to hear'; this would confirm the well-known identification of *φράζω* (*φράζομαι*) with *girdžiu* 'I hear.' The word *ἀθερές* (neut.) which Hesychius explains by *ἀνόητον, ἀνόσιον, ἀκριβές* (Leo Meyer, *Etym.* I. 163) may contain the same stem as Lith. *derē-ti* 'to suit, be fit for, be of use': *ἀθερής* would originally have meant 'useless' and *ἀθερίζω* 'to deem useless.' Others, however, connect *ἀθερίζω* with Skr. *ádharma-* (L. Meyer, *Vgl. Gramm.* II. 53; Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 15).

Brugmann has identified the *ē* of Lat. *fides* with that of *πιθήσω* (*Grundriss* II². I. p. 220). We may add that *fides* is to be identified with the second element of *εὐ-πιθής*. He has also shown that many Latin third declension words in *-ēs*, which were supposed by some to be *s*-stems, are really *ē*-stems, e.g. *sēdēs*, which has the same stem as Lith. *sēdē-ti* 'to sit.' I would add *sub-ōles* and *prōlēs* (*prō-ōlēs*), which have the stem of *ad-olēre* 'to grow,' cf. *νεαλής* 'young, fresh.' The *ol-* of *ad-olēre* comes from *al-* (see Walde, *Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, s.v. *ale*), and *alē-* is as it were a passive of Lat. *alo*. The identification of *-πηγής* in *εὐ-πηγής, καινο-πηγής, μελαμ-πᾶγής* with Lat. *-fāgēs* (third decl.) in *compfāgēs*, so far from being an obstacle to Brugmann's theory (as it must have been from his point of view) confirms it, both words being *ē*-stems.

Sometimes the *ē* is observable in the Greek conjugation though not in the Aorist Passive. For instance, *ᾠαδής* (*Theognis* 296 as emended by Brunck) has the *ē* of *ᾠδήσω*, fut. of *ᾠδάνω* (cf. *αὐθάδης*, Ionic *αὐτώδης*, from *αὐτο-ᾠδης*, Schulze, *Quaest. Epicae*. p. 453); *ἐπιδευής* that of *δευήσομαι*, cf. *ἐνδεής ἐπιδευής ἀνεπιδευής ἀπροσδεής ὑπερδεής* which have the *ē* of *δεήσει*. The same principle can be applied to *ἀμελής* (: *μελή-σει*); *πατροστερής* (cf. *ὀμματοστερής ἀργυροστερής ἡλιοστερής βιοστερής*): *στερήσω*; and to *προαυξής* and *ἀναυξής* (Hippocr.), cf. *αὐξήσω*. The *η* of *νεοαρδής* is perhaps related to that of *ἀρδη-θμός*.

As has been mentioned already, Schulze observes (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that *φειδώ* stands to *ἀφειδής* in the same relation as *αἰδώς* to *ἀναιδής*, i.e. it is a case of *ē/ō* ablaut. On the same principle one may connect *ἀπειθής* with *πειθώ*, *ἀπειθής* with *πειθώ* (unless Avestan *baodah-* has a prior claim), and *πολυηχής* (*ὑψηλής*) with *ἡχώ*. Sometimes the noun in *-ώ* has been replaced by

one in -ω-λή (cf. φειδώ : φειδωλή), e.g. ἀελπής : ἐλπωρή (for *ἐλπωλή); ἀτερπής : τερπωλή; δυσθαλής : θαλπωρή (but also τὸ θάλπος); ἀμεμφής : μεμ-φωλή; perhaps also νηλής is similarly related to ἀλεωρή. Schulze, *K.Z.* 29, 262 and *Quaest. Epicae*, p. 289, distinguishes νάλεFής 'inevitable, ἄφυκτος' from νηλής 'pitiless.'

Wackernagel's analysis of ἀτερπής as ἀ-τερσ-ής (τέρσομαι)—*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16—may be right. If it is an *ē*-stem, τερσέ-μεναι should be compared.

Ἀλής 'assembled' (cf. ἄλῖα 'assembly,' ἄλῖα on the Heracleian Tables) may stand for *sm*-Fᾶλής 'massed together' and be thus related to the Aorist Passive *Φαλῆναι* (: εἰλέω Dor. *Φηλέω* from *Feλ-νέω*). Similarly the Elean word ἀΦλανέως (implying ἀΦλανής) may, if the second *a* is short, be related to a hypothetical ἐ-Φλᾶ-ν-ην, Aorist Passive of this same **Feλ-νέω*, as ἀκλινής to ἐ-κλῖ-ν-ην. But the problem is complicated by the existence of ἀολλής and ἀελλής, cf. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 285 ff.

Especial significance attaches to εὐσταθής, as it contains the enigmatic *θ* of the -θην Aorist. Εὐσταθής and ἐστάθην are both found in Homer. If Wackernagel's theory of the -θην Aorist is right (viz. that it began in the second person sing. and ἐ-δό-θη-ς = Skr. *a-di-thā-h*) then εὐσταθής must be an analogical formation from ἐστάθην. But no sooner is εὐσταθής thus disposed of than the *θ* reappears in σταθερός. This might, it is true, be an analogical formation from σταθῆναι according to the relation βλαβερός : βλαβῆναι, τακερός : τακῆναι, σφαλερός : σφαλῆναι, φανερός : φανῆναι. But when two such assumptions have to be made, both of them become less probable. We may also ask, *en passant*, whether εὐσταθής contains the Indo-Eur. suffix -*dhē*- which Thurneysen finds in Lat. *pūbēs* (see Walde, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.).

The extent to which new adjectives in -ής were formed at a late date according to the most various analogies has been greatly underestimated. I have already mentioned that Wackernagel (*K.Z.* 29) recognised that ἀγκυλοχείλης (correct spelling ἀγκυλοχήλης), ἑτεραλκής and εὐρυπυλές are simply formed from χήλη ἀλκή πύλη. Additional examples of this type are: νεγκονής, Soph. *Ajax* 820 (: ἀκόνη); ἀκαλυφής, Soph. (cf. περικαλυφή, Plato, *Laws* 242 D); κυναναγής, Eur. (αὐγή); ἀναυδής, Epicrat. (*Com.*) 3, 371, Meineke; ἐπαναγής, Menander 4, 249, (Meineke) and Koinè inscriptions, e.g. *G.D.I.* 3749₃₈; πολυπλανής, Eur. (πλάνη); χρυσολαβές ἐγχειρίδιον, Menander 4, 77, Meineke (λαβή); περιπτυχής, Soph. (πτυχή); περιοργής, Thuc. (ὄργη); συναφής, Hippocr. ἀναφής, Plato (ἀφή); ἀγεννής, Eur. θεογεννής, Soph. (γέννα); perhaps also νεήκης προήκης ἀμφήκης ξυρήκης (: ἀκή) and πλινθυφής ταναυφής εὐυφής (ύφή but cf. ύφος). There is therefore no objection on the score of word-formation to Buttmann's combination of ὄξυπενκής (ἐχεπενκής, περιπενκής) with πεύκη.

Several of the words which I have compared with Aorist Passive forms can also be referred to a fem. *ā*-stem, e.g. ἀαγής to ἀγή 'breakage'; αἰμορραγής to ῥαγή 'eruption,' Hippocr. (cf. καταρραγή, διαρραγή id.); εὐρραφής to ῥαφή;

δημορρι
σφαγή;
ὀστρειογ

WH
is relate
not alwa
affords
Dates r
formed

WH
belonged
from a f
and such
the patt

Th
question
preserve
tion of
inscripti
these na
nagel, h
therefor
hesitates
Λανίκης,
theory t
and wer
I see n
ἀριφραδ

And
which a
if not al

θυμ
διπ

βαρ
δορ
δυσ

εὐλ

¹ The a
distinct.

δημορριφής to ριφή (Lycophron); ἐπιχαρής to χαρά (Ionic χαρή); νεοσφαγής to σφαγή; φρενοπληγής to πληγή; κατασκαφή to σκαφή; πολυβαφής to βαφή; δστρειογραφής to γραφή; νεοτριβής to τριβή; εὐφύης to φυή.

Which of these explanations is right in each case, e.g. whether αἰμορραγής is related more closely to ῥαγῆναι or to ῥαγή, is a matter on which a decision is not always possible, though close study of the forms and meanings sometimes affords a clue, e.g. στενοφυής is clearly formed from φυή, not from φυῆναι. Dates must also be considered, e.g. νεοζυγής (Aesch.) can scarcely have been formed from -ζυγή, which is first found in the Koinè word ἀγαζυγή.

What is clear is that an adjective in -ής (or several such) which at first belonged closely to an Aorist Passive form, came to be regarded as derived from a fem. *ā*-stem which happened to exist alongside of it, and then νεηκονής and such words began to be formed from fem. *ā*-stems of all kinds according to the pattern thus created.

This seems to have happened not only in Ionic-Attic (where the nouns in question ended in -ή for the most part and not in -ά) but also in dialects which preserved the original -*ā*. This theory, if correct, provides a new explanation of certain Doric names ending in -νίκης, especially Λανίκης¹ on an old inscription of Thera, *G.D.I.* 4805. Until recently it was customary to refer these names in -νίκης to τὸ νίκος, the Hellenistic equivalent of νίκη. Wackernagel, however, has explained νίκος as a contamination of νίκη and νεῖκος and therefore not older than the date when εἰ became ἰ. Fraenkel therefore rightly hesitates (*Glotta* IV. 40) to find this Hellenistic τὸ νίκος in so old a name as Λανίκης, or in the Arcadian Κλ(ε)ονίκεος (gen.) in *G.D.I.* 1231 b 8. His own theory that these names were originally *o*-stems (nom. sing. ending in -νικος) and were then assimilated to those in -σθένης and -κράτης, has no plausibility. I see no difficulty in supposing that Λανίκης was formed from νίκα after ἀριφραδής had come to be regarded as formed from φραδά.

Another class of analogically-formed adjectives in -ής is constituted by those which accompany a Second Aorist Active. The following list contains most, if not all, of those which are to be met with in the earliest Greek.

θυμοδακής (Hom.) ὠμοδακής (Aesch.) cf. ἔδακον.

διωπετής (Hom.) διοπετής (Eur.) γονυπετής (Eur.) κλινοπετής (Hippocr.)

δυσπετής (Hippocr.) εὐπετής (Hippocr., Hdt., etc.) χαμαιπετής (Aesch.)

δακρυοπετής (Eur.) δοριπετής (φόνος) (Eur.) περιπετής (Eur.) cf. Doric

ἔπετον 'I fell'.

βαρυπεσής (Aesch.) (: ἔπεσον).

δορικανής (Aesch.) πολυκανής (Aesch.) (: ἔκανον 'I slew').

δυσμαθής (Aesch.) εὐμαθής (Aesch.) ἀμαθής (Eur.) ἀρτιμαθής (Eur.)

(: ἔμαθον).

εὐλαβής (Attic prose) μεσολαβής (Aesch.) (: ἔλαβον).

¹ The *ā*-stems ending in -νίκης (-νίκας) are quite distinct. On their history see E. Fraenkel, *Nomina Agentis*, II. 98.

ἀνδροτυχής, εὐτυχής, κακοτυχής, ἐπιτυχής (: ἔτυχον, unless some of these are formed from τύχη).

ἀχανής (Hegesipp. 4, 480 Mein. etc.) (: ἔχανον).

εὐδρακής (Soph.) (: ἔδρακον).

ἐλλιπής (Plato, etc.) περιλιπής (Polyb.) (: ἔλιπον).

ἀρτιθανής (Eur.) δισθανής (Hom.) (: ἔθανον). Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 103, calls δισθανής an incorrect formation, and says it ought to have been διθανής. The fact observed by Bechtel is an additional proof that the word is formed by analogy. We find a complete word, and not merely a stem, as first element in other analogical formations as well, e.g., χαμαιριφής, χαμαιπετής, τηλεφανής, παλινστραφής, παλιντριβής, παλιμβλαστής, and also in the only other compound of -θανής, viz. ἀρτιθανής.

ἀμφιβαλής (Eur.) (: ἔβαλον).

παλιμβλαστής (: ἔβλαστον).

συμπαθής (Polyb.) ἐκπαθής (Polyb.) ἀπαθής (passim) αἰνοπαθής (Hom.).

κληροπαλής (*Hymn to Mercury*) δυσπαλής (Aesch.) cf. πεπαλών.

ἀκραγής (Aesch.) (: ἔκραγον).

τιμαλφής (Aesch.) (ἀλφεῖν).

The starting-point of such formations may have been provided by the words in -παθής. Wackernagel (*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16) shows that αἰνοπαθής is a compound of πένθος, and gives other examples in which the penultimate syllable has the weak grade (to his examples add ἀδιής [: δέος = δέφγος] *G.D.I.* 4801 Thera, Hoffmann *ad loc.*)

The relation of πένθος to -πνθής was lost sight of after the sonant nasal had become α, and it was naturally assumed that -παθής was derived from παθεῖν.

Προσφιλής (κοινοφιλής, θεοφιλής, εὐφιλής, δυσφιλής) and βροτοστυνγής (θεοστυνγής)—all fifth-century words—are perhaps analogically formed from ἐφίλη-σα ἐστύνγη-σα at a date when ἀκρατής had become detached from κράτος and attached to κρατεῖν, or εὐθαρσής to θαρσεῖν.

Finally, the neuters in -ος, to which so much respect has been paid in the past, are not always so very ancient. In fact, some of them, instead of being older than the corresponding adjective in -ής, may have been formed from it, as πάθος is admitted to be at least influenced by αἰνοπαθής. No one will now maintain that τὸ μάθος is a very old word, in view of the ease with which it could be analogically formed from ἀμαθής. Other words in -ος seem to have replaced feminine nouns in -ώ. At any rate the form τὸ ἄχος could easily be understood as an analogical formation from ἄχεος, ἄχει, and these may belong originally to ἡχώ. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254 note 4) shows that the -ώ nouns once had ablaut: Γοργώ: Γοργεῖος (= Γοργεγ-ιος), φειδώ: ἀφειδής.

RODERICK MCKENZIE.

SIPARVM AND SVPPARVS.

A STUDENT who looks out *siparum* in the dictionary is sent on to *supparum*. Forcellini: '*sīpārum* et *sīpārus* et *sīphārum*, v. *supparum*'; '*suppārum*, i, n. et *supparus*, i, m. . . . scribitur autem et *sifarus* et *siparum* et *siparus* et *sipharum*'. Georges¹: '*sīpārum*, *sīphārum* (*sīphārus*), s. *supparum*'; '*suppārum* (*sīpārum* u. *sīphārum*), i, n., u. *suppārus* (*sīphārus*), i, m. (*σίφαρος*)'. Lewis and Short: '*sīpārum* or -us, i, v. *supparum*'; '*suppārum* (*sīpārium*, *sīpārum*, *sīphārum*), i, n. and *suppārus* (*sīphārus*), i, m.' This then is one word, rejoicing in no fewer than eleven forms (most of which I have never met anywhere outside a dictionary²): *supparum*, *supparus*, *sīparum*, *sīparum*, *sīpharum*, *sīpharum*, *siparus*, *sifarus*, *sīpharus*, *sīpharus*, *sīparium*. And to this one word the lexicographers assign two meanings: (1) a topsail (or in military use a sort of banner), (2) a linen garment mostly worn by women. Similar opinions are forthcoming from all quarters: Studniczka *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. altgr. Tracht* p. 90 '*supparus* . . . bezeichnet ein linnen Obergewand der Männer und Frauen, zugleich aber ein Art Segel und segeltüchtige Vorhänge, wie sie im Theater und anderwärts verwendet wurden'; Vaniček *Fremdwörter* p. 79 '*supparus* m., *supparum* n., ursprünglicher Name eines Segels . . . dann ein Frauengewand' (a description taken word for word from Hehn *Kulturpfl. u. Hausth.* p. 154 ed. 2); Pauli in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* XVIII p. 5 '*suppārus*, *supparum*, leinenes gewand, frauenhemde, toppsegel'; Weise *Griech. Wört. im Lat.* p. 181 'nächst der Tunika und Stola ist das am frühesten in der Litteratur auftretende Frauengewand das *supparum*. Sein Name (= *σίφαρον*) ist ein uraltes Lehnwort des Seewesens und bezeichnet ursprünglich ein linnen Segel'; Marquardt *Privatl.* pp. 484 sqq. ed. 2 'das linnene Frauenkleid, welches zuerst in Mode kam, war das *supparum*. Das Wort ist . . . identisch mit *siparum* oder *σίφαρος* (das Segel)'; Lindsay *Lat. Lang.* p. 29 '*supparum*, with byform *siparum*'; Walde *Lat. etym. Wörterb.* '*supparum*, Toppsegel, Bramsegel, auch *siparum*, *sipharum*, aus gr. *σίπαρος*, *σίφαρος* entlehnt'; Keller *Lat. Volksetym.* p. 106 'das Toppsegel heisst lateinisch *supparum* und *supparus*, griechisch *σίφαρος*, *σίπαρος*.'

Facts tell another tale. These are two words, distinct both in form and in significance, and one of them makes its appearance more than two centuries

¹ Georges' article on *supparum* is reproduced, false quantities and all, in Saalfeld's *tensaurus Italograecus*.

² Not even Greek is copious enough for our etymologers, who enrich it with the forms *σίπαρος* and *σίφαρος*: Schuchardt *Vokal. d. Vulgärlat.* II

p. 228, Ernout *Elem. dial. Lat.* p. 234, Keller *Lat. Volksetym.* pp. 106, 168, 175, Saalfeld *Italo-graeca* II p. 26, Weise *Griech. Wört. im Lat.* pp. 69, 181, 293, 517, Walde *Lat. etym. Wörterb.* s. u. *supparum*.

earlier than the other. The word for a topsail is *sīpharum* or *sīphārum*: although its Greek name is σίφαρος in Arr. Epict. III 2 18 βυθιζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου σύ μοι παρελθὼν ἐπαίρεις τοὺς σιφάρους and presumably also in Hesych. ἐπίδρομον . . . τὸ ἰστίον τὸ ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ κρεμάμενον, ὃ καλοῦσι σίφαρον καὶ ἔλασσον (if this conjecture of Casaubon's for φᾶρον is true), its Latin name is neuter; for *sifarus* in *not. Tiron.* IV 4, tab. 109 88 ed. Schmitz., has no more right to count as Latin than *primna* or *bieris* on the same page. The word for the garment is *supparus*, masculine, which possesses, like *carbasus* and *sibilus*, a poetical neuter plural, *suppara*. For a neuter singular *supparum*¹ I can find no evidence but unsupported statements of the stupid and ignorant Nonius, the not very learned or intelligent Priscian, and certain scholiasts at Luc. II 364: Non. p. 540 '*supparum* est linteum femorale usque ad talos pendens, dictum quod subtus appareat', Prisc. G.L.K. II p. 169 '*supparus* περιώμιον et hoc *supparum*', schol. Luc. '*supparum* genus est indumenti', 'hoc *supparum* et haec *suppara*', '*supparum* est uestimentum puellare lineum' etc. (borrowed and corrupted from Paul. Fest. p. 311 *supparus*). Priscian and the scholiasts cite no example; Nonius is less discreet and cites four, one of which is visibly masculine, while the others, of which none is perceptibly neuter, include a verse cited by Festus as an example of *supparus*. It is however quite likely that in the decline of Latin, earlier than Nonius, a neuter singular was fabricated by false inference from the neuter plural, as *sibulum* was from *sibila* and *carbasum* from *carbasa*. The upstart has prospered amazingly: not only has it ousted both *supparus* and *siparum* from their place in the modern lexicons, but it has thence redounded upon the ancient, and in filling the gap at Fest. p. 340^a 20-2 it is thrice introduced by Mueller and Lindsay, once for *supparus* and twice for *siparum*.

The facts of which I speak are the following texts. Wherever the MSS have any variant worth mentioning, I mention it; but in every such case the balance of their authority is in favour of the form which I adopt.

siparum or *sipharum*.

Sen. *ep.* 77 1 'omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba constitit et ex ipso genere uelorum Alexandrinas quamuis in magna turba nauium intellegit . solis enim licet *siparum* intendere, quod in alto omnes habent naues' . . . 2 'ceterae uelo iubentur esse contentae: *siparum* Alexandrinarum insigne est' . *siparum* utrobique VP b, *supparum* V ex corr.

Sen. *Med.* 327 sq. 'alto rubicunda tremunt | *sipara* uelo'. *sipara* E, *suppara* A.

Sen. *H.O.* 698 sq. 'rates quaerit in alto | quarum feriunt *sipara* nubes'. *sipara* E, *suppara* A.

Luc. V 427-9 'flexo nauita cornu | obliquat laeuo pede carbasa, summaque pandens | *sipara* uelorum perituras colligit auras'. *sipara* MZPC, Isid. *orig.*

¹ The lateness of this form is recognised, though not to the full, by Studniczka l.c.

XIX 3 4
et panto
schol. B

Sta
Aui
conuert

Isid

siparum,

iuari n

Lucanu

auras"

From

quam n

et remis

eloquen

Te

Te

uestes c

Pla

nimum

Af

'tace:

No

(Velien

Va

rat ostr

Va

quod s

Pa

subucu

F

'suppa

ap<pe

puni .

consec

nus a

T

C

L

¹ Mr

supparum

which

XIX 3 4, *supara* U, *suppara* VG and all editors, '*sippera* uela sunt minora, unde et pantomimorum uela sic dicuntur, "siphario c. a. u." (Iuu. VIII 186)' schol. Bern.

Stat. *silu.* III 2 27 'uos summis adnectite *sipara* uelis'.

Auien. *Arat.* 760 sq. 'cum portum tenere, auidi uolitantia raptim | *sipara* conuertunt'.

Isid. *orig.* XIX 3 2 'genera uelorum: acation, epidromos, dolo, artemo, *siparum*, mendicum.' . . . 4 '*siparum*¹ genus ueli unum pedem habens, quo iuuari nauigia solent in nauigatione quotiens uis uenti languescit. de quo Lucanus (V 429 above) "summaque tendens | *sipara* uelorum perituras colligit auras"; quod ex separatione existimant nominatum.'

Front. *ep. ad Anton.* I 2 p. 17 Nab. 'quod nunc uides prouenisse, et, quamquam non semper ex summis opibus ad eloquentiam uelificaris, tamen *sipharis* et remis tenuisse iter, atque, ut primum uela pandere necessitas impulit, omnis eloquentiae studiosos, ut lembos et celocas, facile praeteruehi'.

Tert. *apol.* 16 '*siphara* illa uexillorum et cantabrorum stolae crucum sunt'.

Tert. *ad nat.* I 12 'sic etiam in cantabris atque uexillis . . . *siphara* illa uestes crucum sunt'.

supparus.

Plaut. *Epid.* 232 '*supparum* (A and Non. p. 540, *subparum* P) aut subnimum, ricam, basilicum aut exoticum'.

Afran. *epistula* (Non. p. 540, Paul. Fest. p. 311, Ribb. *frag. com.* 122 sq.) 'tace: | puella non sum, *supparo* si induta sum?'

Nou. *paedio* (Non. p. 540, Ribb. *frag. com.* 70) '*supparum* purum belliensem (Veliensem coni. Lipsius) interim, escam meram.'

Varr. *Eumenidibus* (Non. pp. 540 and 549, Buech. *sat. Menipp.* 121) 'auro-rat ostrinum hic indutus *supparum*.'

Varr. *l. L.* V 131 'indutui alterum quod subtus, a quo subucula; alterum quod supra, a quo *supparus*.'

Paul. Fest. p. 311 4 '*supparus* uestimentum puellare lineum, quod et subucula, id est camisia, dicitur'.

Fest. p. 310^a 10-23 (I do not try to show the dimensions of the gaps) '*supparus* <puellare dicebatu>r uestimen<tum lineum quod et s>ubucula ap<pellabatur. Titinius i>n fullonia . . . omne quod . . . <sup>parum puni . . . cat Naeuius de <bello Puni>co. et in nautis . . . <u>estem consec . . . nunc *supparos* . . . na iam crucem . . . detur puella . . . <Afra>nus ait "puella <non sum, supparo si in>duta sum?"'.

Tert. *ball.* 4 'stolam et *supparum*'.

C.G.L. V p. 623 27 'subucula uel *supparis* (read *supparus*) est camisia'.

Luc. II 363 sq. 'umerisque haerentia primis | *suppara* nudatos cingunt

¹ Mr Lindsay has *siparum* in his text but *supparum* in his index, or rather Otto's index, which he has taken over without adapting it duly to his own recension or eliminating its misprints and other errors.

angusta lacertos'. schol. Bern. 'subpara pro amiculis. suppara genus uestis quod alii stolam dicunt, alii thoracem uel amiculi genus'.

Arnob. nat. II 19 'subuculas, suppara, laenas'.

Apoll. Sid. carm. II 326 'pendula gemmiferae mordebant suppara bullae'.

C.G.L. IV p. 180 1 'suppara . . . tunicae quae et subuculae dicuntur'.

The confusion between *sipara* and *suppara*, which has ended in confounding *siparum* with *supparus*, perhaps began in the fifth century, the earliest date which can well be assigned to a poem exhibiting such prosody as *māluit, nēque, mentēque, Thersitēs, Deidamiam*—oo—, and such grammar as *comes esse placet*. The 'uerba Achillis in parthenone' (anth. Lat. Ries. 198, P.L.M. Baehr. IV pp. 322 sqq.) contain the verse, 23, 'arma tegant nostrum potius quam *sipara* corpus'.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

IT
these to
Paley g
obvious
poet ha
See also
but suc

In
present
imperfe
and the
ei with
Λ 467
he even
have no
is subst
= ἦν ἀν
of ei wi

Bu
indicati
εἰθ' ἦβα
be used

Here i
but exp
past ti
to me
refer to
too elas
have be
'may h
someth
else' (c
past li

EURIPIDES, *RHESVS* 720.

ὄλοιτ' ὄλοιτο πανδίκως
πρὶν ἐπὶ γᾶν Φρυγῶν ποδὸς ἵχνος βαλεῖν.

It is plainly absurd to wish that Odysseus, who has been on Phrygian soil these ten years, should perish in the future before he even treads upon it. Paley gets some sense by supplying 'as a conqueror or permanent settler,' but obviously we have no right to supply all that: nor indeed would any Greek poet have ever said such a thing as ἐπὶ γᾶν ἵχνος βαλεῖν ὡς νικῶν or εἰσαεί. See also Mr. Porter's note in *C.Q.* XI. 160. My explanation may be hazardous, but such as it is it would be somewhat as follows:

In the first place, it is notorious that in early Greek poetry the optative, present and aorist, is used in constructions which in strict Attic require imperfect or aorist indicative. I need say nothing of ἔνθα κεν αὐτ' ἀπόλοιτο and the like. But consider optatives after εἰ. Not only does Homer use εἰ with present optative instead of indicative, e.g. B 780 ὡς εἴ τε νέμοιτο, Λ 467 ὡς εἴ ἐ βιβάτο, X 411 ὡς εἰ σμύχοιτο, Ψ 274 εἰ νῦν ἀεθλεύοιμεν, but he even does at least once so use aorist optative for indicative, a fact which I have not seen noticed, κ 416 ὡς εἰ ἰκοίαιτο, 'as if they had come.' At N 343 δς is substituted for εἰ in the sentence μάλα κε θρασυκάρδιος εἶη δς τότε γηθήσειεν = ἦν ἂν δς ἐγήθησεν. And the important point for my purpose is that this use of εἰ with present optative is occasionally found in Attic, as everybody knows.

But we also find εἰ, etc., with optatives in wishes where Attic requires the indicative. Nestor's formula εἶθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι βίη τε μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη means εἶθ' ἡβων βία τε ἦν. So εἶην at II 722, εἶεν at Φ 429. And the aorist also can be used in wishes: N 825,

αἰ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτω γε Διὸς πάϊς αἰγιόχοιο
εἶην ἥματα πάντα, τέκοι δέ με πότνια Ἥρη.

Here indeed Goodwin's palliative, that τέκοι = μήτηρ εἶη, has some force; but explain it as you will, the fact remains that the aorist is used for a wish in past time. And at σ 79, νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἶης, βουγίαε, μήτε γένοιο, it seems to me that it would be rather disingenuous to profess that γένοιο does not refer to the past. It is not really a wish at all; the Homeric optative is much too elastic to be tied down tight,¹ and the tone is rather 'you had better never have been born.' So e.g. in π 102 τάμοι means 'might cut off if he liked,' not 'may be cut!' At λ 613 I think the force of μηδ' ἄλλο τι τεχνήσαιτο is something like 'he needed not to make' or 'should not have made anything else' (cf. Hayman's note); in any case that aorist seems to me to refer to the past like τέκοι and γένοιο, and if the older Homer only uses such aorists

¹ See Goodwin's appendix on this subject in *MT*².

after leading up to them with the milder εἴην or εἴης, the answer to that objection may be that we do not know that the author of the 'second νέκυια' may not have been prepared to go one better than his predecessors.

It is want of allowing sufficient freedom to optatives, I think, that has prevented people from seeing the real meaning of γένοι' οἷος ἐσσι at Pindar, *Pyth.* II. 72, which I take to be this: 'you (i.e. anybody) had better become what you are by nature; mere learning is no good,' *nascitur non fit*: the punctuation is Bergk's, and as it is accepted by Headlam and rejected by Schröder there can be little doubt of its correctness.

Again, τί κεν ῥέξαιμι at T 90 means 'what was I to do?' perhaps literally 'what could I have done?' but I doubt this, for at Γ 52 οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνεις, 'you were not going to withstand,' cannot be so explained; anyhow parallels are easy to find, e.g. Hdt. II. 11, κοῦ γε δὴ οὐκ ἂν χωσθεῖη; 57, τέφ' τρόπῳ ἂν φθέγξαιτο; Ap. Rh. III. 267. Herodotus twice so uses the present optative, II. 45, κῶς ἂν θύοιεν, V. 106, τί ἂν ποίεοιμι; 'what could I be doing?' Some of these *can* be explained otherwise, but if we take a general view of the whole question it seems only reasonable to class them all together. But again the important point is that this usage survives in Attic: Antipho, *Tetr.* Γ β 5, πῶς ἂν ἐπιβουλεύσαιμι αὐτῷ, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἐπεβουλεύθην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; Aesch. *Ag.* 292, καὶ τίς τόδ' ἐξίκοιτ' ἂν ἀγγέλων τάχος; Xen. *Mem.* I. ii. 64, πῶς ἂν ἔνοχος εἴη;

If then certain Ionic uses of optatives are found now and again in Attic, and if Homer two or three times uses aorist optative in wishes, is it altogether impossible that δλοιο in *Rhesus* 720 should stand for εἴθ' ὤλετο?

But I do not believe that the poet could have used *any* aorist optative in this way; there is a peculiarity about δλοιο which helps it. δλοιο is a curse, and so may be used with greater vagueness than an ordinary optative of wishing. When Oedipus cries δλοιοθ' ὅστις ἦν δς ἀγριάς πέδας ἄμματ' ἐπιποδίας, etc., he is not expressing a wish for the future; that would be utterly ridiculous. He simply means 'a curse upon him whoever he was'; and it is no use asking when the curse is to fall. I think this consideration helps us to see the meaning of δλοιο πρὶν βαλεῖν. 'A curse upon him, ere ever he did set foot on our land,' sounds tolerably right; or, if it be hardly tolerable in expression, it gives at any rate a visible sense.

Taking then these two considerations together, I think I see how this puzzling phrase came to be employed. If anyone prefer to explain it by means of only one of the two, I have no objection, but my own fancy is that the poet was influenced by both.

I do not think that Euripides would have done this, but the author of *Rhesus* had perhaps a taste for epic archaism. At 863 he says:

δέδοικα δ' αὐτὸν καὶ τί μου θράσσει φρένας
μὴ καὶ Δόλωνα συντυχῶν κατακτάνῃ.

This use of aorist subjunctive after μὴ to express a fear for the past is pretty common in Homer; it is found nowhere else in tragedy.

ARTHUR PLATT.

NOTES ON THE *BIRDS* OF ARISTOPHANES.

11 οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δία γ' ἐντεῦθεν Ἐξηκεστίδης.

THIS mincing oath 'by Zeus at least' could only be put with any propriety into the mouth of some such character as Cousin Slender in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*; as Sir Hugh Evans, the Welsh parson, says, 'he would be capacity of it.' This is the real basis of Porson's rule, 'Post ius-iurandum, qualia sunt νῆ Δία, νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, et cetera huiusmodi, nunquam sequitur particula γε nisi alio uocabulo interposito.' He accordingly corrected *Thesmoph.* 225:

οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὴν Δήμητρά γ' ἐνταυθοὶ μενῶ.

Δήμητρ' ἔτ' with the further excellent, or rather decisive, warrant of *Wasps* 1442:

οὔτοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ἔτ' ἐνταυθοὶ μενεῖς. (Cf. *Clouds* 814.)

So here the meaning is plainly this: up to now Excecestides might have been able to find his way home, which for him was anywhere, but from here it would be no longer possible even for such an accommodating gentleman to do so. The reading can hardly be other than

οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δί' ἔτ' ἐντεῦθεν Ἐξηκεστίδης.

Strangely enough Porson himself seems to have suggested for no particular reason

οὐδὲ μὰ Δί' ἐντεῦθεν γ' ἂν Ἐξηκεστίδης,

which Reisig essayed to improve by restoring the displaced ἂν, οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δ.

Even Fritzsche's freak ἐνγετεῦθεν has proved attractive to many editors, and in *Knights* 698 the namby-pamby μὰ τὴν Δήμητρά γ', εἰ μὴ σ' ἐκφάγω (Rav.) is apparently supposed to suit the character of Cleon by most scholars, not however by Hall and Geldart, who with more judgement read Δήμητρ', εἰ μὴ.

16 τὸν ἔποφ', ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων.

Several extravagant emendations of the concluding words are current, ἐξ ἀνδρός ποτε and ἀνθρωπός ποτ' ὦν (Köchly), ἐκ τοῦ Τηρέως (A. Palmer). It seems hardly necessary to deviate so far from the tradition. I suggest a less violent remedy

ἐκτὸς ὀρνέων

'aloof from birds,' an outsider bird, such as the hoopoe of the play is afterwards described to be, cf. 71-9, 93-106, and 114 sqq. He is the Wandering

Jew of the bird-world, for he is the real old original Tereus of the legend. At first sight of him Euelpides needs assurance that he is a bird (102):

Τηρεὺς γὰρ εἶ σύ ; πότερον ὄρνις ἢ τᾶῶς ;

Clearly a bird of this description could not be in the bird-market, and this is just the reason why the two adventurers had to go and seek him in the wilds. He was not marketable.

63 οὕτω 'στι δεινὸν οὐδὲ κάλλιον λέγειν.

So the best MSS. R.V.M., but the line is seriously corrupt, admittedly so. Bentley ingeniously proposed οὗτος, τί δεῖ νῶ τοῦδε, κάλλιον λέγειν, making Peisthetaerus the speaker, '*Heus tu, melius est ut dicas quid nos eum uelimus.*' This certainly will not do; but suppose we adopt Bentley's suggestion in part, restoring the speech to Euelpides and giving it a very different but more appropriate meaning:

οὗτος, σέ τι δεῖ νῶ τοῦδε κάλλιον λέγειν.

He addresses the bird and says:

'What ho! there, you must find a better name for us than that.'

Of course νῶν is also possible, 'say to us,' etc.

161 ὑμεῖς μὲν ἄρα ζητε νυμφίων βίον.

This should probably be read as a question. So also 1530 (Meineke, Hall, and Geldart). In 1688 I suggest ἐς καιρὸν ἄρα καὶ κατεκόπησαν. Καὶ 'really' (cf. Soph. *El.* 385) might easily be lost before κατὰ.

168 τίς ὄρνις οὗτος ; ὁ Τελέας ἐρεῖ ταδί .

This line is open to considerable doubt. Hermann rejected ὄρνις not without reason. It ruins both the sense and the metre. Again, why is Teleas introduced as the denouncer of flighty people? It has been suggested as a possibility that, though the worst offender himself, he is hypocritically condemning his own follies: but as τένης (*Peace* 1008) he would probably be too aldermanic for a flutterer. Now Peisthetaerus is serious in this matter, as Euelpides recognizes and even becomes serious himself (170):

νῆ τὸν Διόνυσον εὖ γε μαμᾷ ταυταγί.

The condemnation should be popular, universal, should proceed from 'the man in the street.' Accordingly I propose to eliminate Teleas altogether as an intruder and to read the line thus:

'τίς οὗτος ἔσθ' ;' ὁ <δὲ> γελάσας ἐρεῖ ταδί .

If you ask anyone (sc. τινά, τὸν ἐπιτυχόντα) as to the flutterers, 'What is this creature?' he with a smile will say this: 'It's a human bird,' etc. (ἄνθρωπος not ἄνθρωπος being the reading).

178 ἀπολαύσομαί τί γ', εἰ διαστραφήσομαι.

Many editors read *τι δ'*, giving a curious, if not impossible, position to *δέ* not justified by *Knights* 175, nor can much be said in favour of *γε*. My suggestion is that this last is a survival of *μέγα*, the first syllable having been lost through a lipography of *-μαι με*. 'I shall gain a lot, if I,' etc.

180 EΠ. πόλος; τίνα τρόπον; Π. ὥσπερ εἴποι τις τόπος.

This is the reading of the MSS. The words are meaningless. Dobree inserted *ἄν* before *εἴποι* to make them Greek. He also suggested an alternative *εἰ γ' εἴποις τόπος* with the same object. Most editors adopt *ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις* from 282. Brunck has *ὥς τις εἰ λέγοι*.

The real weakness is in *τόπος*, which has no bearing whatever on the question *Peisthetaerus* is answering or pretending to answer. I take it he said *τρόπος* repeating the *τίνα τρόπον*; of the hoopoe, not in its simple sense but with irresistible quasi-scientific pomposity. Accordingly I would restore:

ὥσπερ εἰκός, εἰς τρόπον.

'As is probable, the *τρόπος* (that is, the movement or turning of the *πόλος*) is uniform.'

The graphical changes involved are not serious, so slight indeed that no discussion seems necessary, even if space would permit.

244 sqq. These lines contain the call to the marsh-birds. Other classes of birds have already been summoned: (1) the field-birds from the farm-lands, whose notes are generalized into *τιδ τιδ τιδ τίο*, etc.; (2) the birds from the garden and the hill-side, who sing *τρισιτὸ τρισὸ τοτοβρίξ*. Afterwards the sea-birds are called. They are not singing birds, but the marsh-birds, as everyone knows are vocal, and yet their call ends with no imitation of their notes as might be expected, but with an appeal to a particular species *ἄτταγᾶς*, the francolin, or, as some say, the woodcock or the godwit. The probability is that neither the *ἄτταγᾶς* nor any other single species could ever have been named here. The word seems to be a corruption, and it may be quite a slight one, of the combined notes of the marsh-birds. If so, the passage should read (*ῥσα* in 245 for *οἷ* is merely a cover for *ἄτταγᾶς*):

οἷ θ' ἐλείας παρ' αὐλῶνας ὀξυστόμους
ἐμπίδας κάπτεθ', οἷ τ' εὐδρόσους γῆς τόπους
ἔχετε λειμῶνά τ' ἐρόεντα Μαραθῶνος ὄρ-
νεις πτερυγοποίκιλοι.

*** **

268 The MSS. read unmetrically *ὠγάθ' ἄλλ' οὔτοσί*. Many suggestions have been made to remedy the defect. 'Ἄλλ' οὖν and *ἀλλά γ'* are the most

popular. Others are ἄλλος, ἀλλ' εἰς and ἀλλὰ χούτοσί. I venture to offer another:

ὦγαθ', ἀλλ' οὐχ οὔτοσὶ καὶ δὴ τις ὄρνις ἔρχεται;

'But, my good man, is not that a bird coming this minute?' The reply is, νῆ Δί' ὄρνις δῆτα, 'Yes, by Zeus, so it is a bird.'

275 νῆ Δί' ἕτερος δῆτα χούτος ἔξεδρον χώραν ἔχων.

The usual explanation of ἔξεδρον 'foreign' 'outlandish' and so 'not native,' οὐ τῶν ἡθάδων (271) is pointless here. If this were the meaning of the adjective, χώραν, which Hall and Geldart adopt from Suidas and a scholium, might well be preferred to χώραν.

The tradition, however, of all the MSS., confirmed by the statement that the phrase is a humorous borrowing from the Tyro of Sophocles, need not be changed. By ἔξεδρον χώραν ἔχων Aristophanes merely meant to say what is perfectly true and characteristic of the cock 'perching aloof from the other birds,' lit. 'holding an aloof-perch position.' Ἐξεδρος is used exactly as in Eurip. *Hipp.* 935 (cf. *Iphig. in T.* 80):

λόγοι παραλλάσσοντες ἔξεδροι φρονῶν,

'words aloof from sense or intelligence.' To give the phrase the same augural meaning as in the passage of Sophocles it travesties would be fatal to the jest.

494 ἐς δεκάτην γάρ ποτε παιδαρίου κληθεὶς ὑπέπιον ἐν ἄστει,
κάρτι καθεύδον, καὶ πρὶν δειπνεῖν τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτος ἄρ' ᾔσεν.

Here a plain tale has been thrown into confusion, as witness the commentaries, by what is after all a slight corruption. If the first letter of ἀνειπεῖν were read as δ, an easy possibility in uncials, ΔΝΕΙΠΕΙΝ, nothing but the δειπνεῖν of the tradition could well be expected from the phenomenon. The meaning is 'and before the others proclaimed the dawn, this fellow crew.' This eccentricity on the part of some misguided bird long before the dawn is not at all unusual. Euelpides unfolds a straightforward tale. There is nothing about drinking secretly before dinner, as would appear from the received text. He went as an invited guest to a christening, as we say. He took part in the festivities: had a little of something to drink—this is the invariable account still given to the magistrate on the following morning—and then (κάρτα not κάρτι) went to sleep. He was awakened by the premature crowing (νύκτωρ) of this bird, and the rest followed accordingly.

537 τοῦτο καθ' ἑμῶν
αὐτῶν ὥσπερ κενεβρείων.

Read αὐτως, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 1040 πεσοῦσαν αὐτως, ὡδ' αὐτως, ὥς μ' ὤλεσεν.

546 ἀναθεὶς γὰρ ἐγὼ σοὶ
τὰ νεοττία κάμαντον οἰκήσω.

Οἰκήσω is almost to a certainty a lipography of οὐκ ὀκνήσω. This Blaydes discerned before me, but he proceeded to suggest most needlessly ἀναθεῖν' ἄρ' for ἀναθεὶς γάρ, completely spoiling the bold declaration of the *Chorus*, that they 'will not quail,' cf. 628:

also οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν ἐγὼ ποθ' ἐκὼν τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἔτ' ἀφείμην.
638 ἀλλ' ὅσα μὲν δεῖ ῥώμῃ πράττειν, ἐπὶ ταῦτα τεταξόμεθ' ἡμεῖς.

555 μηδ' εὐθὺς γνωσιμαχήσῃ.

This is exactly the 'look at the war-map' so persistently recommended by a recent German Chancellor. Zeus must 'recognize the military situation.' There is no question of change of opinion, as some say, any more than there is in *Hdt.* VII. 130: ταῦτ' ἄρα πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐφυλάξαντο γνωσιμαχέοντες καὶ τᾶλλα καὶ ὅτι χώρην ἄρα εἶχον εὐαίρετόν τε καὶ ταχυάλωτον.

566 ἦν δὲ Ποσειδῶνί τις οἶν θύη, νήττη πυρούς καθαγίζειν.

Instead of πυρούς (*v.* 565) I would suggest πύελον, 'to dedicate a bathing-tub to the duck,' an appropriate offering for a water-bird whose name means 'swimmer.' Cf. *Knights* 1060, *Peace* 843.

600 τῶν ἀργυρίων· οὗτοι γὰρ ἴσασι· λέγουσι δέ τοι τάδε πάντες.

Many corrections of λέγουσι to help the rhythm here have been attempted, ἄδουσι (*Elmsley*), ὑμνοῦσι (*Reisig*), etc. With even less straining of the tradition we might read:

οὗτοι γὰρ ἴσασ'· ἀλέγουσι δέ τοι τάδε πάντες.

'for they all pay regard to such matters.' Cf. *Pind. Isth.* VIII. 103 φαντὶ γὰρ συναλέγειν καὶ γάμον Θέτιος ἀνακτα.

660 κατάλειψ' ἡμῖν δεῦρ' ἐκβιβάσας, ἵνα παίσωμεν μετ' ἐκείνης.

Instead of the rather inane ἵνα παίσωμεν I suggest that Aristophanes probably wrote ἀναπαίσωμεν, 'let us deliver the Parabasis.' This is just what they proceed to do, as soon as the actors quit the stage, cf. 681-3, and the Parabasis is in some respects, if not absolutely, the most important part of an Aristophanic comedy.

753 εἰ μετ' ὀρνίθων τις ὑμῶν, ὃ θεαταὶ, βούλεται
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὥς ἡμᾶς ἴτω.

It is obvious that διαπλέκειν (τὸν βίον) and ζῆν τὸ λοιπόν mean just the same thing. The whole point of the epirrhema (753-67) is that discredited

knaves and rascals are whitewashed in bird-land. They are to be honoured not held in disgrace. Accordingly I would read :

διαπρέπειν,

'to be men of mark,' 'personages of distinction.' They are not to be mere nobodies. Their peccadillos are to be almost patents of nobility, a really fine prospect. 'Εκπερδικίσαι (768) 'to go over to Perdikkas,' 'to side with the Kaiser.'

807. This seems a confidential communication to the audience, and might be better punctuated thus :

ταυτὶ μὲν ἡκάσμεσθα· κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον
τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς.

'These are the comparisons made of us. As Aeschylus says, "These shafts are winged with feathers all our own."'

812 φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἡμῖν ὄνομ' ἔσται τῇ πόλει ;

Bentley's τοῦνομα is usually accepted, but the traditional ὄνομα may be right :

φέρ' ἴδω, τί δὴθ' ἡμῖν ὄνομ' ἔσται τῇ πόλει ; (Cf. 817.)

823 τὰ τ' Αἰσχίνου γ' ἅπαντα ; Π. καὶ λῶστον μὲν οὖν
τὸ Φλέγρας πεδίον.

Perhaps instead of καὶ λῶστον we might read κὰν ᾧ 'στιν, i.e. τόπῳ. Even if this be the best joke of the three, the poet would hardly be likely to say so.

841 φύλακας κατέστησαι, τὸ πῦρ ἔγκρυπτ' αἶε.

This last direction can scarcely be considered humorous. Perhaps ἐπίτυφ', 'kindle,' may be nearer the mark, cf. 1161. It is clear enough the watch-fires are to be lit.

850 παῖ παῖ. Possibly παπαῖ or βαβαῖ.

1081 τοῖς τε κοφίχοισιν ἐς τὰς ῥίνας ἐγγχεῖ τὰ πτερά.

There is just one letter wrong in the verb here. Read ἐγχοῖ (ἐν and χόω=χώννυμι), 'crams in.' Feathers could not be 'poured' into the nostrils of blackbirds.

1146 ἐς τὰς λεκάνας ἐνέβαλλον αὐτοῖς τοῖν ποδοῖν.

Probably αὐτως, 'just so.' There is no real need for αὐτοῖς here.

1190 πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ θεούς. ἀλλὰ φύλαττε πᾶς.

Read ἄγε for ἀλλά. The corresponding antistrophic line is 1264 :

μηκέτι τὴν ἐμὴν διαπερᾶν πόλιν. . . .

1221 ἀδικεῖς δὲ καὶ νῦν. ἄρά γ' οἶσθα τοῦθ' ὅτι.

Perhaps we should read ἀδικεῖς δὲ καινόν, 'but your crime is a new one.' The offence being absolutely new explains on the one hand why the question in 1219 cannot be answered, and on the other makes it necessary to impress upon Iris the serious nature of the new crime which, she is told, deserves capital punishment.

There is a pointed humour in this, but little, if any, in ἀδικεῖς δὲ καὶ νῦν.

1273 ὦ τρισμακάρι', ὦ κατακέλευσον. Π. τί σὺ λέγεις ;

The idea that κατακέλευσον is an appeal of the herald either 'bid me stop' (my compliments), or 'signal me to begin' (my message), seems to me exceedingly unlikely; nor is Dindorf's 'suggest a few more epithets' any better.

Might we not read the line thus :

ὦ τρισμακάρι'. Π. ὦ κατακέλευσον. τί σὺ λέγεις ;

'O thrice-blessed, . . . Π. O ring off! What have you to tell?'

Κατακέλευσον would literally mean 'order that down,' cf. καταβοάω, etc.

1376 ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σώματί τε νέαν ἐφέπων. . . .

I venture to suggest a line curiously near the tradition (which adds a very doubtful σώματι to φρενί) :

ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σώμ' ἀτιτάνιον ἐφέπων.

This he might well have said: 'Driving an untitanic body with a fearless soul.' He is flying up to Olympus (ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλύμπον) as bold, though not as big, as a Titan.

1441 τοῖς μαιρακίοις ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοις ταδί ;

There is serious objection to μαιρακίοις here. Boys would not be very likely to sympathize with the speakers. They might even admire the offenders. In fact, remarks of this kind could only be made by an elderly man to elderly men. I suggest as probable and certainly more appropriate :

τοῖς ἡλίκοις,

'to those as old' (sc. as themselves), cf. *Acharn.* 702. It is at least doubtful whether boys would be tolerated at all by their gossiping fathers in barbers' shops.

1501 Π. οἴμ', ὡς βδελύττομαί σε. ΠΡ. τί γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς ποιεῖ ;

ἀπαιθριάζει τὰς νεφέλας ἢ ξυννέφει ;

Π. οἴμωζε μεγάλ'. ΠΡ. οὕτω μὲν ἐκκαλύψομαι.

The last reply of Prometheus is not really so inconsequent as it appears. There is a jest here, and it is of the kind exemplified by *Ecclesiast.* 404 (*Class.*

Quart., January, 1919, p. 14). The assumption is (cf. 1501) that Peisthetaerus said with exactly the same sound as οἴμωζε μεγάλη :

οἴμ', ὡς δὲ μεγάλη (sc. νέφη).

'O my! and what big ones!' This reassures Prometheus, and he declares at once, 'If that is the case, I'll uncover.'

1562 κατ' ἀνῆλθ' αὐτῷ κάτωθεν
πρὸς τὸ λαῖμα τῆς καμήλου
Χαιρεφῶν ἡ νυκτερίς.

Most editors read τὸ λαῖμα after Bentley (= θῦμα Hesych.). B. B. Rogers adopts a suggestion of W. C. Green's, πρὸς τό γ' αἶμα, but the position of γε is unlikely. We should probably read :

πρὸς στάλαγμα τῆς καμήλου,

'to the blood-drip of the camel,' cf. Soph. *Antig.* 1239. The corruption would begin with the omission of the second sigma.

1608 νῦν μὲν ὑπὸ ταῖς νεφέλαισι ἐγκεκρυμμένοι
κύψαντες ἐπιιοκοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ βροτοί.

I take exception to κύψαντες here. The explanation, 'inclinantes sese' (Hemsterhuis), is not at all appropriate to describe the behaviour of a man taking a false oath. He would, in fact, betray himself at once by this attitude. However, unless I mistake, the true reading is only slightly different from the tradition :

ὑψ' ὄντας (cf. Ζεὺς δ' ἡμενος ὑψι, *Il.* XX. 155).

Mortals do not scruple to use you for perjury, because (1) you are up aloft, and (2) they are screened from your sight by the clouds.

1615. I suggest that the Triballian's ναβαισατρεῦ is according to Poseidon something like ναί · 'πήνεσ' · εὔ, whereas he was really saying he was very hungry, ἐμὲ πείνα τρύ(ει). This is, of course, somewhat strained, but scarcely, if at all, more so than the current solutions which seem to need a little reconsideration.

T. L. AGAR.

MANCHESTER.

εἰ
τῆς πό
πόλει ε

'M
follows
conver
state."
retaine
note w
of this

At
that th
rulers,
houses
enterta
things
be bliss

It
As the
the ruli
will ha
splend
realizes
the nob
the hig
his arg
forward
with the
temptat

¹ Cf. N.
οἶκον κατα
γάρ τις κα
κ.τ.λ.

² 362C π
θυσίας καὶ
π ὡς θύειν
reduction
as one of t
by Kleisth

PLATO, *REPUBLIC* 421B.

εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς μὲν φύλακας ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιούμεν, ἥκιστα κακούργους τῆς πόλεως, ὃ δ' ἐκείνο λέγων γεωργούς τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἐστιάτορας εὐδαίμονας, ἄλλο ἂν τι ἢ πόλιν λέγοι.

'MORE simply expressed,' write Jowett and Campbell, 'the sense is as follows: "If the idea of a state requires the citizens to be guardians, he who converts them into rustic holiday-workers will mean something that is not a state."' This rendering, which seems to be necessary if the traditional text is retained, is difficult to reconcile with the preceding argument. Although this note will suggest an emendation, its chief purpose is to indicate the connexion of this passage with the argument of which it is the closing sentence.

At the beginning of Book IV. an imaginary objector (τις 419a 2) urges that the guardians will not be happy under Socrates' scheme. Unlike other rulers, they have no lands or fine houses, or an equipment consonant with such houses (πρέπουσαν κατασκευήν);¹ they have no private sacrifices,² and do not entertain guests.³ In short: they have neither silver nor gold, nor any of the things commonly associated (πάντα ὅσα νομίζεται) with those who are to be blissfully happy.

It is evident that the happiness here contemplated is in the grand style. As the footnotes indicate, each single characteristic is a mark of that virtue of the ruling class which the Greeks called μεγαλοπρέπεια. Since the guardians will have no money, it is evident that this dazzling tradition (λαμπρότης) of splendid living and noble spending cannot be continued. Socrates fully realizes that this loss is the objector's point. One does not, he says, expect the noblest part of a statue to be the most highly coloured; so, it is implied, the highest class in the state should not demand exceptional pleasures.⁴ If his argument is to convince the imaginary objector whom Adeimantos puts forward, he must show that pleasures of this rare quality are incompatible with the guardian's work. Mere rustic jollity (such as γεωργούς implies) is no temptation to the μεγαλοπρεπής.

¹ Cf. Nic. Eth. I. 123a 6: μεγαλοπρεποῦς δὲ καὶ οἶκον κατασκευάσασθαι πρεπόντως τῷ πλούτῳ (κόσμος γὰρ τις καὶ οἶκος), καὶ περὶ ταῦτα μᾶλλον θαπανᾶν κ.τ.λ.

² 362c πλεονεκτοῦντα δὲ πλουτεῖν . . . καὶ θεοῖς θυσίας καὶ ἀναθήματα ἱκανῶς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς θύειν κ.τ.λ. In Aristotle, Pol. 1319b 25, the reduction of the number of ἴδια ἱερά is mentioned as one of the democratic reforms made in Athens by Kleisthenes and also in the city of Cyrene.

Cf. Laws 909d-910. The great family of the Alcmaeonids sacrificed to the Carian Zeus (Hdt. V. 66), and the Gephyraei also had separate rites to the Achaean Demeter (Hdt. V. 61).

³ ξενοδοκοῦντες. At the wooing of Agariste Kleisthenes καὶ ἅμα ἐξείνιζε μεγαλοπρεπῶς (Hdt. VI. 128). Cf. Eth. 1123a 3.

⁴ Compare a similar figure in Aristotle, Pol. III. 13 (1284b 8).

Consequently Socrates imagines men of another class invested with the trappings of a great man or dining in state and attempting to carry on their work at the same time: ἐπιστάμεθα γὰρ καὶ τοὺς γεωργοὺς ξυστίδας ἀμφιέσαντες καὶ χρυσὸν περιθέντες πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐργάζεσθαι κελεύειν τὴν γῆν, καὶ τοὺς κεραμέας κατακλίναντες ἐπὶ δεξιὰ πρὸς τὸ πῦρ διαπίνοντάς τε καὶ εὐωχουμένους τὸν τροχὸν παραθεμένους, ὅσον ἂν ἐπιθυμῶσι κεραμεύειν κ.τ.λ. We may remember the young Pheidippides in the *Clouds*, whose Alcmaeonid mother crooned to him a song about the magnificent Megakles:

ὅταν σὺ μέγας ὦν ἄρμ' ἐλαύνῃς πρὸς πόλιν,
ὥσπερ Μεγακλῆς, ξυστίδ' ἔχων.

70

Naturally the lad despised his father's goats and goatskins at rocky Phelleus, and spent royally like a good Alcmaeonid. In the same way the farmers will neglect their task for the state that they are expected to maintain. It is an easy inference that rulers, with temptations no less in kind and degree, will confuse the essentials with the accidentals of power.

But that is not the conclusion drawn in the sentence at the head of this note. It seems to say that the rulers will be seduced by the pleasures of the vulgar. But the farmer was only mentioned above to illustrate the effect of living like a lord; the objector did not propose that the lord should enjoy himself like a farmer. The text cannot be defended by pointing out that the ruler should, on the objector's view, possess lands; for he will hold them as a *grand seigneur*. Nor is it relevant to quote that sentence in Book III. (417a) which suggests that guardians in pursuit of gain will become business men and farmers. That states rather the effect of *acquisition* (κτήσονται) on whatever scale upon men's interests; this deals with the *pleasure* of using large possessions (κεκτημένοι) in a large way. Has not γεωργοὺς crept into the text because the word is repeatedly used in the illustration? I do not think it is sufficient to say that Plato loftily refuses to distinguish between the two grades of pleasure when the distinction is the objector's point.

The presence of γεωργοὺς in the text colours the interpretation of πανήγυρις and ἐστιάτορας. But a πανήγυρις may be viewed from two sides. It is not only the opportunity for the vulgar to enjoy themselves (cf. Aristophanes, *Peace* 340); it is a national festival, provided by men of wealth and station or giving occasion for display appropriate to their station.¹ I suggest that Plato had in mind those public services or λειτουργίαι which are performed τοῖς χρήμασι, not τῷ σώματι,² or (as Aristotle put it) are δαπανηραὶ μὲν, μὴ χρησιμοὶ δέ, οἷον χορηγίαι κ.τ.λ.³ The expenditure could only be undertaken by wealthy men, and was an opportunity for display. Ordinarily ἐστιάτωρ is the giver of a state dinner, whether to the tribe or, as was done by the more magnificent, to the city (see note 4). As such feasts took place at the Dionysia or the

¹ For the Greek view cf. *End. Eth.* 1122a: οἷον τὴν θεωρίαν οὐκ ᾤετο θεμιστοκλεῖ πρέπειν, ἣν ἐποιήσατο Ὀλυμπίαζε, διὰ τὴν προὔρξασαν ταπει-

νότητα, ἀλλὰ Κίμωνι.

² Lysias, *Or.* XIX. 58.

³ *Pol.* 1309a 18.

Panath
a natu
spirited
service
suggest
ἀλλ' οἱ
objectio
criticisi
φιλοτιμ
true gu
trapping
only ma
virtue o
insists t
defined
χρόνου,
But the
rich and

QUEEN
K

¹ Schol.
² Demo
καὶ ἐστιάτωρ
these wer
1122b 22:
ἡ τριηραρχ
³ For t
λειτουργίαι
⁴ Other
and λεωρ
κακούργους
to doubt
criticism i
λέγων . . .
place of su
they have
Another

Panathenaea,¹ the association of the word with *πανήγυρις* seems to make this a natural sense here. The greatest of the burdens assumed by the public-spirited was the *χορηγία*, a name which also covered all such 'useless' services. As we find *χορηγός* and *ἐστιάτωρ* linked together in Greek usage,² I suggest that the text should read *ΧΟΡΗΓΟΥΣ τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἐστιάτορας εὐδαιμόνας*. Then the argument will meet the objection fairly; the atmosphere of this reply is the same as that of the criticism. Socrates distinguishes between the function of the ruler and the *φιλοτιμία* traditionally associated with his station.³ He will have his rulers true guardians of the city: the objector, he contends, confuses office with the trappings of state. But while they may be appropriate in a *πανήγυρις*, they only make a seeming ruler, not a real one (cf. *ὄντες*) (*δοκοῦντες*, 421a).⁴ If the virtue of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* is to be a characteristic of the guardians—and he insists that it shall be⁵—it must take a new direction. That direction is thus defined in 486a: *Ἡ οὖν ὑπάρχει διανοία μεγαλοπρέπεια καὶ θεωρία παντὸς μὲν χρόνου, πάσης δὲ οὐσίας, οἷον τε τούτῳ μέγα τι δοκεῖν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον*; But the traditional splendour of the ruler will only sharpen the conflict between rich and poor (421c 8).

A. S. FERGUSON.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
KINGSTON, CANADA.

¹ Scholiast on Demosthenes, *Lept.* 21.

² Demosth. *Lept.* 21 *χορηγοὶ καὶ γυμνασάρχαι καὶ ἐστιάτορες*. . . . *Or.* XXXIX. 7, XXI. 156; these were *σέμν' ἀναλώματα* (158). Cf. *Eth.* 1122b 22: *οἷον εἰ που χορηγεῖν οἰονταὶ δεῖν λαμπρῶς ἢ τριηραρχεῖν ἢ καὶ ἐστιᾶν τὴν πόλιν*.

³ For the connexion between *φιλοτιμία* and *λειτουργία* see e.g. *De Corona* 257, *Eth.* 1122b 22.

⁴ Other emendations are *ἀργούς* (Richards) and *λεωργούς* (Adam). These words echo *κακούργους* in the preceding line. But I venture to doubt whether a repetition of the implied criticism is required. For the clause *ὁ δ' ἐκείνο λέγων* . . . appears merely to state the proper place of such rulers as the objector asks for—if they have a function, it is in the *πανήγυρις*.

Another possibility may be mentioned, although

it is less probable. The city sent to Olympia and other great *πανηγύρεις* a *θεωρός* magnificently dressed, like the farmers in the illustration. While *ΘΕΩΡΟΥΣ* is possible, it seems to be less likely than *χορηγούς*, because the latter word was commonly associated with *ἐστιάτωρ*, and covered all such services, while the office of *θεωρός* was an exceptional duty performed outside the city. On the whole, as the cause of the misreading was psychological, it seems not improbable that a scribe with *ΓΕΩΡΟΥΣ* in his mind might read it into the *ΧΟΡΗΓΟΥΣ* of the manuscript. If Plato was carrying on the terms used in his illustration (which is conceivable), then it may be noted that the *χορηγός*, like the farmers, was splendidly attired.

⁵ 487a, 494b, 536a.

A NINTH-CENTURY COMMENTARY ON PHOCAS.

ONE of the most learned and prolific writers of the ninth century was Remigius of Auxerre¹ (c. 841-908). In addition to lengthy expositions of several books of the Bible, he wrote Commentaries on Donatus, Priscian,² Eutyches,³ Beda,⁴ the *Disticha Catonis*,⁵ Sedulius, Martianus Capella,⁶ Boethius, and Phocas.

The Commentary on the *Ars de Nomine et Verbo* of Phocas⁷ was extant in the twelfth century at Brogne and Anchin, and later at Peterborough and Ramsey.⁸ Nothing, however, was known of it until Manitius claimed to have discovered a series of excerpts from it in a MS. at Rouen (No. 1470, saec. x./xi.) from which he printed a number of brief extracts.⁹ A complete—or practically complete—copy of this Commentary exists in a MS. in the British Museum which was unknown to Manitius. The following account of this MS. will serve to give an idea of the work, and to show that Manitius was correct in regarding the glosses in the Rouen MS. as abridged and rearranged from the Commentary of Remigius:

MS. Royal 12. F. iv., vellum, 3 unnumbered and 202 numbered folios measuring 28 by 18 cms., single columns with 38 lines to the page. Titles in red, and initial letters frequently illuminated in green, blue, yellow, and red. The MS. proper (i.e. ff. 1-202) is written in a hand of the latter part of the twelfth century, and there are a few marginal notes in a hand of the same period. At the top of f. 1a is written in a modern hand, *Liber Iohannis Theyer*¹⁰ *de Cowpers Hill iuxta Glouc.*, and from a note on f. 1b we learn that the MS. had previously belonged to Horsham Priory, co. Norfolk.

Of the three unnumbered folios bound in at the beginning of the MS., the recto of the first is blank, on its verso are a few scribbles in late hands; the second and third are a fragment of some twelfth-century service-book¹¹ with

¹ For general accounts see Hauréau, *Hist. de la Philos. Scolastique*, i., 1872, pp. 199-206; Huemer, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 96, 1880, pp. 505-551; Manitius, *Gesch. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, i., 1911, pp. 504-519.

² Cf. Manitius, *Münchener Museum für Philol. des Mittelalters*, 2, 1913, pp. 79-98.

³ Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 101-108.

⁴ Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 98-101.

⁵ Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 109-113.

⁶ Esposito, *Didaskaleion; Studi filologici di letteratura cristiana antica*, iii., 1914, pp. 173-181.

⁷ Phocas is thought to have lived in the second half of the fifth century, cf. Teuffel, *Gesch. röm.*

Lit., 6^e Aufl., iii., 1913, § 472, 4.

⁸ Cf. Manitius, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 32, pp. 681-683.

⁹ *Neues Archiv*, 36, 1910, pp. 47-48; *Gesch. lat. Lit.*, i., 1911, p. 510; *Didaskaleion*, ii., 1913, pp. 73-88.

¹⁰ Of Theyer's valuable collection of about 800 MSS. some 312 are now in the British Museum (cf. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, art. Theyer, John). Theyer lived from 1597 to 1673.

¹¹ According to Mr. J. P. Gilson, who has kindly furnished me with some particulars about the MS., these fragments are from an antiphonal.

musica
of Rem
Libri]
Scriptu
unfinis
Patrol.
on f. 2

W
Remig
comm
f.
A
asserit

A
compr
apo tis
Is

posuit.
pentan
quod r
corum
fecit li
nomin
per cor

Es
matico
scilicet
te prin
O
opus.¹¹

S
multa
que ne
T
inuut.¹¹

O
garrulo

¹ This
edition
1911).

² I.e.
Keil's e
410-439)

being co
³ In t
Phocas i

musical notation. The MS. proper contains, ff. 1a-18b, the Commentary of Remigius on Phocas; ff. 19a-197a [Isidori Hispalensis¹ Etymologiarum Libri]; ff. 197b-202a, written in double columns [Allegoriae Quaedam Scripturae Sacrae, auctore Isidoro]. The scribe has left this last work unfinished. It breaks off on f. 202a with the words, *a colonis apostolis* = Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, 83, cols. 97-125. Then follow a few notes in a modern hand, and on f. 202b a few more scribbles.

We may now proceed to give some extracts from the Commentary of Remigius, which embraces nearly the whole text of Phocas.² In the MS. the comments are written in black, the words of Phocas being in red.³

f. 1a: Incipit Expositio Remigii Super Focam.

*Ars mea multorum es, quos secula prisca tulerunt; Sed noua te breuitas asserit esse meam.*⁴

*Ars dicitur ab artis preceptis, id est a strictis regulis, eo quod uniuersa comprehendat.*⁵ *Ars etiam est congregatio uel perceptio rerum et dicitur apo tis aretis, id est a uirtute.*⁶

Iste Phocas in exordio libri sui prefaciunculam elegiaco carmine composuit. Elegiacum carmen est ubi primus uersus est exameter et sequens pentameter. Elegos grece, miseros latine. Inde elegiacum carmen dicitur eo quod miseris conuenit.⁷ Sciendum autem est quod antiquissimus grammaticorum fuit iste Phocas adeo ut de illo Priscianus multa sumpsit exempla. Et fecit librum suum de duabus partibus, de substantiali et actuali, id est de nomine et uerbo, et alloquitur suum librum per apostropham figuram, id est per conuersionem.

*Es, scilicet tu,*⁸ *mea ars*⁹ *inquit ars multorum. Quos, scilicet grammaticos.*¹⁰ *Tulerunt, id est deportauerunt. Prisca secula, id est antiqua secula scilicet. Asserit, id est affirmat. Noua breuitas te esse meam artem, non enim te primus adinueni sed de aliorum libris te accepi.*

*Omnia cum ueterum sunt explorata libellis, Multa loqui breuiter sit nouitatis opus.*¹¹

Sit nouitatis opus, id est sit mihi nouum opus. Multa loqui breuiter, id est multa dicere breuiter. Cum sint explorata, id est inuestigata; omnia scilicet quae necessaria sunt ex libellis ueterum.

*Te relegat iuuenis, quem garrula pagina terret, Aut si quem paucis seria nosse iuuat.*¹²

O mi te relegat, id est iterum legat iuuenis; quem terret, id est horrescit; garrula pagina, id est uerbosa. Aut si quem iuuat, id est delectat; nosse, id

¹ This MS. is not referred to in Lindsay's edition of the *Etymologiae* (2 vols., Oxford, 1911).

² I.e. that portion on pp. 410-436, line 25, of Keil's edition (*Grammatici Latini*, v., 1868, pp. 410-439), only the last two and a half pages not being commented on.

³ In the extracts above I print the words of Phocas in italics.

⁴ Phocas, p. 410, 2-3.

⁵ Cf. Isidori *Etymol.*, i., 1, 2 (ed. Lindsay).

⁶ Isid., *ibid.*, i., 5, 2, Alii dicunt a Graecis hoc tractum esse uocabulum [ars] ἀρὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, id est a uirtute.

⁷ Isid., *ibid.*, i., 39, 14.

⁸ as cod.

⁹ Ed., p. 410, 4-5.

¹⁰ tuo cod.

¹¹ gramaticos cod.

¹² Ed., p. 410, 6-7.

est scire; *seria*, id est certas regulas nominum et uerborum; *paucis*, id est breuiter.

*Te longinqua petens comitem sibi ferre uiator Ne dubitet, paruo pondere multa uehis.*¹

Ne dubitet uiator te ferre sibi *comitem*, id est socium; *longinqua petens*, id est longa pergens O mi liber; *uehis*, id est portas.

f. 18b (the work ends): *Ferio feris percussi.*² *Ferio* ostendit tertiam coniugationem et non habet preteritum. *Hoc*,³ scilicet uerbum quod est edo. *Infinitiui*⁴ *modi presentis temporis*⁵ *non re*⁶ *sillabam, sed in se contra morem omnium mittit.*⁷ Ideo contra morem quia in re debuisset dicere. *Esse enim dicendum est: uolo uis uolui: hoc quoque*,⁸ scilicet uerbum quod est uolo, *incerte est coniugationis et in futuro imperatiui et infinitiui*⁹ *modi deficit et in gerundiis*¹⁰ *uel participialibus, que alii supina dicunt: meto messui facit*,¹¹ *nam aliter proferri non est.*¹² *Hec*,¹³ scilicet uerba, *polleo*, id est cresco, *furio*, id est insanio, *sisto*¹⁴ uel stare facio, *similiter et glisco*, id est opto uel cresco, *et quatio nullum habent preteritum.*¹⁵ *Memineris*, id est recorderis, *etiam*¹⁶ *incoatiue forme uerba in preterito perfecto deficere.*¹⁷ Quare? Quia (*qua* cod.) incoatiua forma non potest habere preteritum. Finit Ars.

Manuscript copies of the *Ars* of Phocas are common,¹⁸ and the work appears to have been fairly well known during the earlier Middle Ages.¹⁹ There was extant at Glastonbury in 1247 a Commentary on it by a certain Cornutus,²⁰ but this work has disappeared, and with the exception of Remigius of Auxerre we know of no other commentator on the *Ars*.²¹

With regard to the other grammatical commentaries of Remigius, to the MSS. enumerated by Manitius²² we can add the following:

(a) Commentary on Donatus, Basel, F. iii. 32; Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 385, pp. 345-358, saec. xiii., imperfect; London, British Museum, Burney 315, pp. 11-25, saec. xiv. (on the *Ars Minor*); Oxford, Bodleian, E Mus. 96, s. xiv. in. (*Ars Minor*); Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q^o. 50, s. xiv.²³

(b) Commentary on the *Disticha Catonis*, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 144, ff. 74-75, s. ix. ex., *Tria sunt requirenda initio uniuscuiusque libri persona locus et tempus . . . hos breuitas fecit sensus coniungere binos.*

(c) Commentary on Sedulius, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 144,

¹ *Ed.*, p. 410, 8-9. For *uehis* Keil reads *uehens*. The reading *uehis* is given by the Munich and Wolfenbüttel MSS. collated by Keil, and our text agrees with these MSS. in several other readings.

² *Ed.*, p. 436, l. 18.

³ *infiniti* Keil.

⁴ *in re* K.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 20-21.

⁶ *gerundi* K.

⁷ *potest* K.; *ibid.*, 21-23.

⁸ *sisto* om. cod.

⁹ *tamen* K.

¹⁰ Teuffel, *Gesch.*, iii.⁶, § 472, 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹² *praesens tempus* K.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

¹⁴ *infiniti* K.

¹⁵ *messem feci* K.

¹⁶ *Hec* om. K.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 23-24.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 24-25.

¹⁹ Manitius, *Gesch.*, i., pp. 46, 167, 279, 281, 460, 464, 492, 509.

²⁰ Manitius, *ibid.*, p. 509.

²¹ Keil (*Gr. Lat.*, v., pp. 406-7) mentions two anonymous Commentaries on Phocas, Munich, 19454, pp. 145-236, s. xi., and Vatican, Reg. 1560, ff. 24-35, s. xi. The first seems identical with, and the second closely allied to, the work of Remigius described above.

²² *Gesch.*, i., pp. 506-515.

²³ The Commentary on the *De Barbarismo* in Gotha, Membr. ii., No. 126, ff. 12-24a, s. xii./xiii. (Jacobs, *Beiträge zur älteren Litteratur*, i., 1835, p. 228), is perhaps that of Remigius

ff. 1-74, s. ix. ex.; Cheltenham, Phillipps 25146, s. xi. (present locality doubtful); Durham, Cathedral Library, C. 4. 10, s. xii.; Edinburgh, Advocates' Library, 18. 5. 10, s. xi. in., f. 12b; Oxford, Bodleian, Junius 25, f. 182b, s. ix.; Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 134, ff. 1-53, s. xii. in., end missing.¹

The eleventh-century catalogue of books belonging possibly to Worcester Priory (Bannister, *English Historical Review*, 32, 1917, p. 389) includes a *Commentum Remigii super Sedulium*, and *Remigii Commentaria super Sedulium* are found in the list of Bale's books (*Scriptorum Brytanniae Catalogus*, Pars ii., Basileae, 1559, p. 167).

(d) Commentary on Martianus Capella, Basel, F. v. 17, ff. 1b-38a, s. x. (first two books only); Brussels, 5092-94, ff. 1a-13a, s. xii. (first two books); Berlin, Lat. 179 (formerly Phillipps 1817), ff. 2a-28b, s. x. (first book only);² Cambridge, Trinity Coll., 27 (B. 1. 29), ff. 144a-177b, s. xii./xiii. (apparently only the first two books and perhaps not the work of Remigius); Glasgow, Hunterian Museum, 280, ff. 36, s. xii.; Leyden, Lat. 167, s. xii.,³ and Perizonius xviii., 2, s. xiii. ex.; London, British Museum,⁴ Reg. 15. A. xxxiii., ff. 4a-239a, s. ix./x.; Oxford, Bodleian, 20628 (Auct. T. 2. 19), ff. 1-166b, s. ix. ex., and Merton Coll., 291, s. xii. (probably the work of Remigius); Paris, Lat. 14754, saec. xii.; Rome, Vatican, Reg. 1970.

ADDENDUM.

Since the above was printed off [1917] I have noted the existence of several other MSS. of the Remigius commentaries:

(a) On Donatus, Admont 756, s. xiii.; Erlangen 165, s. xiii.; Linz 203. 9, s. xii.; Paris 17161, f. 168b, s. xii. ex.; Rome, Vatican Reg. Christ, 1578, s. xi.

(c) On Sedulius, Earl of Leicester, Holkham Hall (Norfolk), 419, s. xi.

(d) On Martianus Capella, Avranches 240, ff. 17-101, s. xi.; Cambridge, Univ. Library Mm. 1. 18, s. xiii. (first book only); Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana, Plut. 16, 1, s. xv.; Dresden Dc. 180, s. xv. (first two books); Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana Plut. 51, 15; 51, 18; 90, 19; Bibl. Magliabechiana, vi. 177, s. xiv/xv. (first two books); Karlsruhe, Aug. Frag. 138, ff. 2, s. x.; Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek Rep. I. fol. 4, ff. 163b-184a, s. xi. (first two books); Rep. I. 4. 71, ff. 1-55, s. xii.; London, Harl. 2506, ff. 86a-93b, s. x., introduction with excerpts from eighth book; Oxford, Bodleian Canon. Misc. 18, s. xi. (first two books); Rome, Vatican lat. 3428, s. xii. (first two books); Ottob. 1516, s. xiii. (on book one); Ottob. 1840, s. xiii.; Vienna Endlicher 330; Wolfenbüttel, Gud. lat. quarto 180, s. x.

(e) Extracts from the Commentary on Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* have been printed by H. F. Stewart (*Journ. Theol. Studies*, xvii., 1916, pp. 22-42). As for the Commentary on the same author's *Opuscula Sacra*, Mr. Souter (*ibid.*, ix., 1908, p. 149) appears to doubt the attribution to Remigius, and suggests that Haymo may have been the compiler.

M. ESPOSITO.

¹ Other copies are possibly Bruges, 168, s. xii., and Brussels, 5665, s. xii.

² This MS. bears the superscription *Expositio Martiani a Iohanne Scotto cepta*, but the Commentary is that of Remigius.

³ This MS. is similarly inscribed *Expositio Martiani a Iohanne Scotto excerpta*, and Manitius

has wrongly given it as a copy of the work of Johannes (*Gesch.*, i., p. 337).

⁴ This MS. has been fully described by the present writer (*Zeits. für celtische Philologie*, ix., 1913, pp. 159-163, and *Didaskaleion*, iii., 1914, pp. 173-181).

ALEUAS AND ALEA.

THE significance of the name of the goddess worshipped at Mantinea and at Tegea, Athena Alea, is correctly interpreted by M. Fougères in *B.C.H.* 16 (1892), p. 573. "Aléa Athèna," he says, "signifie la déesse Aléa, qui ressemble à Athèna. Par cette addition on a voulu marquer les rapports entre la déesse Protectrice d'Arcadie et la déesse tutélaire d'Athènes." He calls attention to the fact that in the language of Homer and Hesiod the Greek word ἀλέα denotes 'la protection qui éloigne le mal.'

The appellation of the goddess is derived from the root seen in the verb ἀλεύω, 'ward off, keep far away,' seen also in the middle ἀλέομαι, 'avoid, shun.' The verb in the active is used several times by the poet Aeschylus, notably in Io's cry, ἄλευε δᾶ, and in *Sept.* 141 and in 87, ἰὼ θεοὶ . . . κακὸν ἀλεύσατε. In both these passages and in the others in which the word is used the strong apotropaic force of it is apparent. The name Alea is given to Athena in Arcadia in the places mentioned, and according to Mommsen there has been a substitution of the title *Alexandros* for *Alea* in the scholium on Pindar, *Pyth.* 9. 30, in which passage we are told that Adrastus became king of Sicyon, and established the shrine of Hera called Alexandros: ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Σικωνῶνος καὶ τῆς Ἡρας τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καλουμένης ἱερὸν . . . ἰδρύσατο (see Gruppe, 5. 2. 1126).

It is strange that the name of Aleuas, the prehistoric ancestor of the Thessalian Aleuadae, has not been associated with this root. I have found no attempt to interpret his name except that of Curtius (*Griech. Etym.* 1358, p. 433), who wrongly derives it from ἀλέω, 'grind.' Meyer (*Griech. Etym.* 1294-5) distinguishes between ἀλέφω 'avert' and ἀλέσγω 'grind,' as Curtius does not. There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that the name Aleuas means the Averter, and that it is to be classed with those names so frequent in the northern parts of the Greek peninsula, Alexander, Amyntas, Amyntor. It is probable that the appellation was attached to Heracles (the ancestor of the Aleuadae according to Pind. *Pyth.* X.) as health-daemon, in which aspect he was worshipped in the country bordering on the Malian Gulf (see Gruppe, 5. 2. 486). Gruppe points to the connexion of Heracles with the group of divine physicians, Asclepius, Amynos, Alexanor, Alkon, Alkathoon, Alkidias, Alkaios, and to the epithets of Heracles ἀλεξίκακος, ἀποτρόπαιος, σωτήρ. He mentions also his connexion with Auge, a birth-goddess, and Hebe, goddess of youth. Further, Heracles appears down to the very end of

antiquity as averter of all evil incantations (see Gruppe, *op. cit.* p. 453 sq.). His activities as Idaean Dactyl (Paus. IX. 27. 8, and IX. 19. 5) point in the same direction.

The myth about Aleuas, told in Aelian *H.A.* 8, 11, brings him into the circle of divine healers of the order of Melampus and Heracles. He is said to have been a young shepherd on Mt. Ossa, with whom a serpent fell in love, kissed his hair, licked his face, and brought him all kinds of gifts. According to Apollodorus 2. 2. 2 Melampus owed his gift of second-sight to a grateful brood of serpents, who, in return for his giving their mother the funeral rite of burning, purified his ears with their tongues, so that he understood the voices of birds and beasts. Melampus in origin is himself a Thessalian (see Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros*, 60 and 177) and was also a herdsman.

I count Aleuas as a health-spirit of Thessaly, in all probability closely connected with the Thessalian worship of Heracles Ἀλεξίκακος, ancestor of the Aleuadae according to Pindar.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

LUCAN I. 99-103.

- nam sola futuri
- 100 Crassus erat belli mora. qualiter undas
 101 qui secat et gremium gracilis male separat Isthmos,
 102 nec patitur conferre fretum : si terra recedat,
 103 Ionium Aegaeon frangat mare.

READ thus the simile presents nothing eccentric. In ver. 101 Hosius and Lejay (in his excellent little edition of Book I., published by Klincksieck in 1894) read *male separat*, which not only common sense requires but codd. VUQ authorize : not so Mr. Haskins, who follows a multitude of codd. in offering *mare separat*. But a slight further correction is necessary : to read *Aegaeon* in 103 for the MS. *Aegeo*, 'Withdraw the land, and Aegaeon would smash Ionian Sea.' Those who make *Isthmos* the subject of *frangat* cite Stat. *Silu.* IV. iii. 59:

Inous freta miscuisset Isthmos,

but this hardly parallels 'Isthmos would make Aegaeon an instrument to smash Ionian Sea.'

Aegaeon (perhaps Lucan actually wrote *Aegaeo*, Latinizing the nominative) must be the subject. For the form *Aegaeon*, *-ōnis*, cf. Stat. *Theb.* V. 288 :

Cycladas Aegaeoni

amplexo,

in Val. Flaccus, *Arg.* I. 629 and IV. 715. Voss and Salmasius correct the *Aegon* of the MSS. to *Aegan* (= *Aegaeon*). The personification, which these forms imply, is suitable where the Aegaeon is thought of as a collective force.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

GLASGOW.

ON LVCRETIUS II. 355-360.

at mater uiridis saltus orbatâ peragrans
†nonquit humi pedibus uestigia pressa bisulcis
omnia conuisens oculis loca si queat usquam
conspicere, amissum fetum completque querellis
frondiferum nemus †adsistens et crebra reuisit
ad stabulum desiderio perfixa iuueni.

356 nonquit O, oinquit Q, linquit Q corr., oinquit G, noscit Lachmann.
359 adsittens OQ, adsistens Q corr.

IN the summer of 1919, in the high Sierra of California, I chanced to talk with a cattleman who had driven his herd from the lower valleys to the highlands for summer pasture. When he had arrived at his destination he found a cow missing. He retraced his route, and forty miles below he found the cow by the roadside. Her calf, by reason of its weakness, had been picked up by a waggoner and brought on, and the cow was found at the identical spot where the calf had been taken from the ground; the cow had found the place and had remained there for five days. The occurrence gave rise to a general discussion by the cattlemen present concerning the habits of these animals. When a cow misses her calf she will go by memory to the place where the calf was last seen by her, and will stay there for days; but she will graze and not go hungry herself. The cow will also search by smell; she can smell a herd or the odour left on bushes or that attached to footsteps for hours certainly, possibly for days. The calf also will stay for days where the mother left it. The bereaved cow will try to find her calf first by sight, then by memory, and lastly by smell.

In the light of this expert testimony, *noscit*, in 356, so far as the sense goes, is probable; and in 359 a word meaning 'stopping' is required. According to the cattlemen, Lucretius is accurate in this description, even to what is said in verses 359 and 360.

My proposal *conciit* in verse 356 (*Univ. Cal. Class. Phil.* III. 18) may be defended by Sil. VII. 463 'ferebat praedicto sacrae uestigia concita plantae,' and Sid. V. 176 'concita . . . uestigia.'

W. A. MERRILL.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. XXXIX. 4. 1918.

Elizabeth H. Haight, *An 'Inspired Message' in the Augustan Poets*. Collects and arranges the evidence that Augustus as a part of his political and religious policy associated himself closely with the cult of Apollo, and that this feature is faithfully reflected in the court poets, Vergil as in the fourth *Eclogue* and the sixth *Aeneid*; Horace as in the *Carmen saeculare*; Tibullus in his one national poem on the inauguration of Messalinus as a custodian of the Sibylline books; Propertius in the elegies referring to the Actian Apollo; and Ovid in various connexions. Evan T. Sage, *The Date of the Vatinius Law*. Considers the order of the principal events of the year 59 B.C. and dates them as accurately as possible, the passing of the law being placed at least in the latter half ('possibly in the last third') of the year. J. P. Postgate, *Vindiciae Phaedrionae*. Notes, chiefly exegetical, on some seventeen passages where the fabulist or his text has been criticized without sufficient cause. La Rue Van Hook, *The 'Thought Motif' of Wisdom versus Folly in Greek Tragedy*. In reference to Professor Knapp's paper in *A.J.P.* 37 on the *Antigone* of Sophocles the writer shows that the same motif may be traced in the *Electra* and *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles and the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus. W. A. Oldfather and A. S. Pease, *On Aeneas Tacticus* and *On the Keotói of Julius Africanus*. Brief notes on the text of these works. Norman W. De Witt suggests that *praenaricari* means properly to 'straddle beforehand,' and that to many people *delirare* may have meant to be 'out of plumb.'

XL. 1. 1919.

R. B. Steele, *Curtius and Arrian*. Part I. *The Narrative in Curtius*. Curtius cares more for colour than accuracy in details. He shows many traces of Roman and especially Livian influence. In names he has many peculiarities. His numbers come chiefly from Diodorus, occasionally from Arrian. His chronology and topography are generally inexact. In Verg. *Aen.* I. 574 E. G. Sihler proposes 'Tros Tyriusue: mihi nullo discrimine agetur.'

Atene e Roma. XXI. Oct., Nov., Dec., 1918.

P. Fraccaro, *The Storia dei Romani of G. de Sanctis*. [Three volumes have appeared; Vol. III., in two parts, deals with the age of the Punic Wars.] Shows immense learning, insight, and able criticism throughout; the author does not, like Mommsen, alternately attract and repel, but carries the reader with him. [It is interesting to note that De S. revives and strongly supports the theory of Perizonius and Niebuhr that many of the Roman legends arose from primitive epics.] M. C. Mondini, *Private Letters of Roman Egypt*. An account of some of the contents of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XII. M. Quartana, *Marcia and Cornelia in the Poem of Lucan*. Marcia is thoroughly Stoic, and must be judged in the light of the most rigid form of Stoicism, of which Cato is the great representative. Cornelia, on the other hand, is thoroughly human, 'exquisitely and completely feminine.' Lucan has depicted her with great truth, sympathy, and skill. A. Gandiglio, *Il vecchio di*

Còrico.
Wool a
papyri
referre
1916),
of the
object
and b
necessi
poetry
and ne
Káthupo
the an
pity w
destiny
strophe
every v
Pelleg

Be
N
Heft
H. Le
D

Griechen
he con
excava
D

Demost
Die E
E. Sch
the tre
artiller
known
which
1900)
Jugend
Cicero
Libri.

D
ed. L.
Th. Bi
of some
Rhein-
(G. W
index.

D
in die
Of val
19
Stamm
torum C
which

Còrico. An Italian translation of *Senex Corycius*, a Latin poem by Pascoli. A. Roscio, *Wool and Looms in Greco-Roman Egypt*. A popular account, mainly gleaned from the papyri. P. Fabbri, *A new Translation of the Poetica of Aristotle*. The translation referred to is that of M. Valgimigli (with introduction and notes; Bari, Laterza, 1916), which is described as an important contribution not only to the interpretation of the *Poetic* but to the study of Aristotle and of Greek literature in general. The object of *μῦθος*, says V., is 'neither reality pure and simple nor something more and better than reality'; it is 'reality according to the law of probability and necessity.' 'Even an event that has actually taken place becomes an object of poetry only in so far as it is conceived as possible according to the law of probability and necessity. All the mistakes of a work of poetry are deviations from that law.' *Káθaporis* consists in 'relief from the terror which gripped and tore the heart during the anxious expectation of the catastrophe'; and also in 'the letting loose of that pity which, held back at first and, as it were, frozen amid the shadows of unknown destiny, now bursts forth and overflows when confronted by the irreparable catastrophe.' Aristotle often shows that he regards some form of *ἡδονή* as the object of every work of art. The *káθaporis* is the *ἡδονή* proper to tragedy. Obituary: Giuseppe Pellegrini (A. Taramelli).

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1918.

Nov. 30. *Jenaer medizin-historische Beiträge*. Hrsg: von Th. Meyer-Steineg. Heft 1-10 (Kind). These studies will interest scholars and archaeologists. H. Lehner, *Die antiken Steindenkmäler des Provinzialmuseums in Bonn* (Anthes).

Dec. 7. B. Schweitzer, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der geometrischen Stile in Griechenland. I.* (Rubensohn). The reviewer gives a long account of this work which he considers very valuable, especially because of the use made of the results of excavations in Palestine.

Dec. 14. G. Kleindienst, *De causa orationis in Nausimachum et Xenopithem Demosthenicae* (XXXVIII.) (Rüger). A careful examination of the case. J. Geysler, *Die Erkenntnistheorie des Aristoteles* (H. F. Müller). A detailed study of the subject. E. Schramm, *Die antiken Geschütze der Saalburg* (Anthes). The author has rewritten the treatise published in 1910. It is fully illustrated with ancient representations of artillery and pictures of modern reconstructions. A valuable guide to all that is known on the subject. K. Löschhorn contributes an article on Xen. *An. I.-III.* in which he gives reasons for preferring the text of Sorof (Schulerausgabe, Teubner, 1900) to that of Gemoll. J. Tolkiehn in an article on *Der Titel der rhetorischen Jugendschrift Ciceros* argues (from Quintil. II. 14, 4 *Graeco nomine utatur* and Priscian's *Cicero rhetoricon II.*) that the title of the *De Inventionem* was *Rhetoricon* (not *Rhetoricorum*) *Libri*.

Dec. 21. L. Cohn et S. Reiter, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, Vol. VI., ed. L. C. et S. R. (Stählin). Deserves as high praise as the earlier volumes. Th. Birt, *Aus dem Leben der Antike* (Roszbach). Intended for the general reader but of some value to the specialist. E. Anthes, *Spätromische Kastelle und feste Städte im Rhein- und Donaugebiet*. Illustrated. X. *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission* (G. Wolff). Includes a useful summary of the work done in recent years and an index. W. Bannier contributes a paper *Zu den attischen Gesetzänderungsgesetzen*.

Dec. 28. Fr. Groehl, *De syntaxi Firmiciana* (Blase). W. Schubert, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). The best general work on the subject. Of value to the specialist.

1919. Jan. 4. G. Sandsjoe, *Die Adjektiva auf -aios, Studien zur griechischen Stammbildungslehre* (Eberhard). I. Sajdak, *Historia critica scholiastarum et commentarum Gregorii Nazianzeni. Pars prima* (Stählin). 'There are more than 800 MSS. which are either described or, at least, classified in this book.'

Jan. 11. G. Przychocky, *De Gregorii Nazianzeni epistulis quaestiones selectae* (Stählin). The writer, who is editing the Letters for the Cracow Academy, discusses their language and style. R. Forrer, *Das römische Zabern, Tres Tabernae* (Anthes). An elaborate study of all the available evidence, fully illustrated; throws light on late Roman fortification. K. Löschhorn contributes a paper, 'Kleine grammatische und kritische Bemerkungen zu Sallust.'

Jan. 18. J. Ruska, *Zur ältesten arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst* (Wiedemann). The writer is a mathematician and an Orientalist, and is exceptionally well qualified to deal with the difficulties of his subject. O. Rossbach proposes to read in Verg. *Catal.* 14 (6), 9, 'Marmoreusque tibi, haut mille coloribus ales.'

Jan. 25. K. H. Meyer, *Perfektive, imperfektive und perfektische Aktionsart im Lateinischen* (Meltzer). E. Assmann contributes a paper, 'Fehlgriffe und neue Wege bei der Erforschung kleinasiatischer Eigennamen.'

Feb. 1. A. Kocevalov, *De μέλλειν verbi constructione apud graecitatis classicae scriptores* (Meltzer). Useful especially for the material collected. W. Kahle, *De vocabulis Graecis Plauti aetate in sermonem Latinum vere receptis* (Klotz). A contribution to the history of the language and civilization of Rome. E. Hermann, *Sachliches und Sprachliches zur idg. Grossfamilie* (Meltzer). On the etymology of a number of words for the relation of various members of a family. A. Bauer, *Die Herkunft der Bastarnen* (Schmidt). The writer seeks to prove that the Bastarnae were Celts.

Feb. 8. K. Brugmann, *Zu den Wörtern für 'heute,' 'gestern,' 'morgen' in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (Hermann). O. Fiebigel und L. Schmidt, *Inscriptensammlung zur Geschichte der Ostgermanen* (Huelsen). A large collection of Greek and Latin Inscriptions down to 565 A.D., with notes based on the careful study of recent works and periodicals. Contributions: K. Brugmann, Homerisch ἐπιάρροθος, ἐπίρροθος. A. Kunze, *Zu Sallust Jug.* 38, 10, where he proposes to read 'quia mortis metu movebantur' (for 'mutabantur').

Feb. 15. N. Wecklein, *Textkritische Studien zur Ilias* (Drerup). The reviewer gives an interesting summary and criticism of W.'s views. F. Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern* (Fehrle). This book belongs to the series of 'Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten.'

Feb. 22. T. Klee, *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen* (Boesch). The treatise puts together in convenient form the results of recent work on the subject. E. Brall, *Lateinisch FORIS FORAS im Galloromanischen* (Meltzer). A study of the use of the words in Latin occupies the first thirteen pages. K. F. Johansen, *Sikyonische Vaser.* Illustrated (Schweitzer). A Danish work on the vases usually called 'Protocorinthian.' The reviewer, who is about to publish a book entitled 'Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte der geometrischen Stile in Griechenland,' discusses the history of these vases with special knowledge. E. Schwyzer contributes to this number a note in which he suggests that the Σκαυαὶ Πύλαι were so called because the entry bent towards the left and so caused the attacker to expose his right flank. This was the usual plan, and so the epithet meant no more than 'strong.' If this be so we may infer that the poem at one time knew of only one gate to the citadel of Priam, and it was only when the word σκαυαὶ was mistaken for a proper name that other gates were introduced.

Mar. 1. E. Schwartz, *Zur Entstehung der Ilias* (Eberhard). The study of Wilamowitz' work *Die Ilias und Homer* (1916) caused the author of this little book to think over the problem again. The reviewer gives an interesting sketch of the contents. G. Schütte, *Ptolemy's Maps of Northern Europe.* A reconstruction of the prototypes (Philipp).

Mar. 8. G. Hellmann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Meteorologie.* Vol. 2 (Boll).

Mar. 15. R. Berndt reviewing, among other school books, C. Stegmann's *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*, discusses the question how far and at what stage historical

gramma
arrange
that the
is the to

Ap
A comp
Latin a
of the p

Bo
B.

signatur
(Lat. in
postular
ex. s.c.
d.e.r.e.e
anno vii
Maximi

Clas

Car

fifty-nin

Παραγο

arbitrat

evasive,

the refe

by Aldu

Aldus's

lost Par

Playwri

argumen

playwri

Three, M

with ex

that the

the inse

'Notes

to be

Ep. II.

XI

A.

Scheria

Anteced

its Eur

Books.

Diaeres

of Abst

parative

Collecti

the reig

account

with en

grammar should be taught at school. St.'s book is scientifically sound and is well arranged. Ch. Hülsen contributes to this number a paper in which he suggests that the subterranean building discovered in October, 1917, near the Porta Maggiore is the tomb of Antinous.

Apr. 5. M. Jeanneret, *La Langue des Tablettes d'Exécration latines* (Hermann). A complete grammar by a pupil of Niedermann which will be useful to students of Latin and of the Romance languages. These tablets throw light on the language of the people from the first century B.C. to the fifth A.D.

Bodleian Quarterly Record. Vol. II. No. 22.

B. P. Grenfell, *A Latin-Greek Diptych of A.D. 198*. A Latin diptych with Greek signatures acquired in Cairo and presented by Professor Sayce to the Bodleian (Lat. inscr. 10-11). The main portion is: Q. Aemilius Saturninus praef. Aeg. postulante C. Terentio Sarapammo ne Meviae Dionusario e lege Iulia et Titia et ex. s.c. M. Iulium Alexandrum quo ne ab iusto tutore tutela abeat tutorem dedit d.e.r.e.e.b.t.s.s. actum Alex. ad Aeg. viiii Kal. Octobre Saturnino et Gallo cos. anno vii imp. Caesarum L. Septimi Severi Pii Pertinacis Arabici Adiabenici Parthici Maximi et M. Aureli Antonini Augg. mense Thot die xxvi.

Classical Philology. XIV. 1. 1919.

Carl D. Buck, *Words for 'Battle,' 'War,' 'Army,' and 'Soldier.'* A collection of fifty-nine words from I.E. languages with their etymologies. G. M. Calhoun, *Παραγραφή and Arbitration*. Concludes that a παραγραφή could be filed with an arbitrator at any time before the award, that he could quash any παραγραφή obviously evasive, and that, whether filed with him or with the instructing magistrate prior to the reference, it followed the usual course of arbitration. E. T. Merrill, *On the Use by Aldus of his MSS. of Pliny's Letters*. Substantiates in detail Keil's view that Aldus's readings are due far more to conjecture than to faithful reproduction of the lost Paris MS. Chas. Knapp, *References in Plautus and Terence to Plays, Players, and Playwrights*. Deals with words, e.g. comoedia, tragoedia, tragicomoedia, poeta, fabula, argumentum, actor, choragus, scaena, and with allusions to the audience, contemporary playwrights and plays not uncommonly burlesqued, etc. E. B. Lease, *The Number Three, Mysterious, Mystic, Magic*. Examples of this perfect number from all periods, with explanatory notes. Tenney Frank, *The Columna Rostrata of C. Duilius*. Argues that the inconsistencies in spelling which have been urged against the genuineness of the inscription may be due to its being restored in the second century B.C. In 'Notes and Discussions' P. Shorey proposes οὐδὲν δεῖ <διὰ> τοῦτο ἀψυοεῖν = 'no need to be perplexed on this account'; and Jas. E. Dunlap suggests that in Pliny, Ep. II. 14. 5, *Laudiceni* is to be taken as punning on **laudi-dic-eni*, 'praise-speakers.'

XIV. 2. 1919.

A. Shewan, *Scheria-Corcyra* (II.). Argues in favour of a Minoan settlement in Scheria, and urges again the reality of Homeric narrative. H. W. Prescott, *The Antecedents of Hellenistic Comedy* (VI.). Continues his argument against the theory of its Euripidean origin. John A. Scott, *Some Tests of the Relative Antiquity of Homeric Books*. Considers the arguments based on (1) Aeolic Infinitives before the Bucolic Diaeresis, (2) Οὐδὲν as Adjective, (3) Hiatus in the Bucolic Diaeresis, (4) Frequency of Abstract Nouns. R. B. Steele, *The Method of Arrian in the Anabasis*. Comparative rather than critical. W. L. Westermann, *The Irrigation System of Egypt*. Collection of the scattered notices in papyri and elsewhere from the First Dynasty to the reign of the Roman Emperor Probus. Paul Shorey, *On δέ γε in Retort*. A full account of this combination of particles, which marks sharp contrast or continues with emphasis. In 'Notes and Discussions' A. S. Pease suggests that in Cicero,

De consulatu II. 30, *lapsu* means 'failure,' and that the reference in *ea*, etc., is to the events foretold by the portents in the *Bellum Octavianum* of 87.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1919.

Feb. 10. E. Bourne, *A Study of Tibur* (Winter). From the data of the CIL, the life of a municipal town is reconstructed.

Feb. 24. C. H. Moore, *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire* (Hadzsits). J. O. Lofberg, *Sycophancy in Athens* (van Hook).

Mar. 3. Dr. E. Riess and Professor C. Knapp discuss the number and arrangement of the pictures described in *Aen.* I. 466-493.

Mar. 10. G. M. Stratton, *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle* (C. K.). This work includes text and translation of the fragment *De Sensibus*, and comments by Professor A. E. Taylor.

Mar. 17. Lane Cooper, *The Greek Genius and its Influence* (C. K.). Material for the study of ancient classics in translations.

Mar. 24. E. L. White, *The Vestal Virgins*. This paper studies the sources and supplies a bibliography. W. S. Messer, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (McCartney). T. R. Glover, *From Pericles to Philip* (Ferguson). 'A delightful book.'

Mar. 31. J. L. Hancock, *Studies in Stichomythia* (Bassett). A minute study of the particles in dialogue. E. P. Franklin discusses the possible corruption of the text of Plautus and Terence through the reproduction of manuscripts by dictation.

Apr. 7. F. H. Fowler discusses 'Latin Adjectival Clauses with the Subjunctive,' maintaining that in such clauses the modal meaning is never lost.

Apr. 21. G. Murray, *Religio Grammatici* (Messer). 'This lecture . . . might well form the *credo* of any classicist who wishes to teach and to write with enthusiasm and inspiration.'

May 12. T. Dempsey, *The Delphic Oracle* (Hewitt). A convenient summary.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. II. 1918.

This volume contains 98 pages of letter-press as against 167 pages in Vol. I. But it has 70 plates as against 54; 45 of these illustrate the work of Pietro Cavallini. The Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche shows no diminution in the beauty of its printing notwithstanding the nearness of Bergamo to the seat of war.

There are three articles dealing with classical subjects:

1. *Terracotta arulae*, by E. Douglas Van Buren. 'These arulae originate with the Greek colonies; they are not found however on the Greek mainland, and must therefore reveal a usage and, possibly, a cult either purely local or brought from somewhere other than the mother-country of the settlers. The subjects represented are schemes common to Oriental art, and here the Loryma basis comes to our assistance: for it shows that precisely on an altar basis just such subjects were treated. Presumably, then, the Greek colonists knew of the use of sculptured altars as tomb monuments in Asia Minor at any rate, if not in Greece proper, and in their new homes they perpetuated this form of memorial, but in miniature, depositing it *within* instead of *upon* the tomb. Although this was the original purpose of the arulae, it is easily conceivable that they were soon also dedicated as ex-votos in sanctuaries, or even employed in houses for commemorative or domestic cults, which would account for their presence in temples and dwelling-houses.'

2. *The Gallic Fire and Roman Archives*, by Lucy G. Roberts. It is the purpose of this paper to determine, so far as possible, the effect of the Gallic invasion on the archives of the city. In the descriptions of the rebuilding of the city by Diodorus, Livy, Plutarch, the work on private houses is most emphasized, though Livy and Plutarch speak of the restoration of the temples. But 'there is a striking absence of explicit notices both in regard to the destruction and rebuilding of the city. . . . The

emphas
Plutarc
such w
tion wa
that so
dedicat
by the
buildin
interve
484 B.C.
of a sin
any int
other e
Sancus
restorat
by Tan
restored
survive
Dionys
was ins
belonge
certain
Fidius,
the Gar
almost
temples
probabl
number

3.
These m
stateme
of inter

Re
P.
that J.
embark
the Nile
Sat. XV
Petrie
(1) Am
describ
(5) the
of the C
employ
by whic
Barbele
adcurare
verbs,
Aristoph
in the b
Greeks (

emphasis on the *expiatio*, in the description of the rebuilding given by Livy and Plutarch, as well as the fact that the restoration of the temples could take place in such wholesale fashion, seems to indicate that the need of reconstruction and purification was greater than that of rebuilding.' Archaeological evidence seems to show that some at least of the temples escaped destruction. The temple of Saturn was dedicated 498 B.C., not restored till 42 B.C. Such is the tradition, and it is confirmed by the remains. We find the type of construction which is found in pre-Gallic buildings, and the type found in the time of Augustus, but none belonging to the intervening period. Of the temple of Castor, tradition says that it was dedicated in 484 B.C. and restored (first) in 117 B.C. Here again we find remains of construction of a similar character to that found in other buildings of these dates and no trace of any intermediate building. There are several temples for whose survival there is other evidence than that of the extant remains. The temple of *Dius Fidius Semo Sancus*, dedicated 466 B.C., stood till the second century A.D. without any recorded restoration. Dionysius says he saw in this temple the treaty concluded with *Gabii* by *Tarquinius Superbus*. As it is unlikely that this document would have been restored, if destroyed in 387, it seems probable that the treaty and the temple both survived. As to the temple of *Diana* on the *Aventine* founded by *Servius Tullius*, Dionysius says that the bronze pillar on which the treaty then made with the *Latins* was inscribed survived in the temple to his time. Pliny believed that certain statues belonged to the pre-Gallic period. The antiquity of some of these seems reasonably certain. 'The evidence points to the survival of the temples of *Saturn*, *Dius Fidius*, *Diana*, *Ceres*, and perhaps of *Juno*. This regard for temples, on the part of the *Gauls*, is entirely in keeping with their characteristic religiosity. . . . Probably almost all of the international documents deposited on the *Capitoline* and in the other temples escaped destruction. Of the other records, the *leges* in the temple of *Saturn* probably survived, as well as the *senatus consulta*. In this connection, the large number of early *leges* and *senatus consulta* known is of interest.'

3. *Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii*, by A. W. Van Buren. These notes 'are believed to possess a certain value in part as correcting traditional statements about well-known monuments, and in part as calling attention to matters of interest which have long passed unobserved.'

Revue de Philologie. XLI. 3. 1917.

P. Hippolyte Boussac, *L'Exil de Juvénal et l'Ombos de la XV^{me} Satire*. Maintains that J. was exiled to the oasis of El-Khargeh in Egypt. He would probably have embarked at Puteoli for Alexandria, and have travelled to Canopus and thence up the Nile to Tentyris. While there he learnt the story which forms the subject of *Sat.* XV. Ombos is to be identified with the ruins of Kôm-Belal, excavated by Petrie and Quibell in 1895. P. Lejay, *Essais et Notes sur Virgile*. Discusses (1) *Ampsancus*; (2) *ara Palici* (IX. 585); (3) the five elements in X. 100-102 are described in terms of Pythagoreanism; (4) the neutrality of the gods in X. 108; (5) the use of *quin* in X. 614; (6) denies Warde-Fowler's doctrine (*Vergil's Gathering of the Clans*, p. 65) that Vergil repeats the same imagery in the same simile; (7) Vergil's employment of nocturnal scenes and moonlight effects; (8) a discussion of the means by which the sense of the middle voice was expressed in Latin. An elaboration of Barlebenet's view that some compound verbs have the force of a middle, e.g. *adcurare* = 'to give oneself the trouble'; (9) the passive participles of intransitive verbs, e.g. *regnatus*, *triumphatus*. REVIEWS: J. W. White, *Scholias on the Aves of Aristophanes* (G. Méantis). Favourable, but some of the statements and hypotheses in the book are 'parfaitement en l'air.' C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (A. Laumonier). A useful summary, but 'ne vise pas à l'originalité.'

De consulatu II. 30, *lapsu* means 'failure,' and that the reference in *ea*, etc., is to the events foretold by the portents in the *Bellum Octavianum* of 87.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1919.

Feb. 10. E. Bourne, *A Study of Tibur* (Winter). From the data of the CIL, the life of a municipal town is reconstructed.

Feb. 24. C. H. Moore, *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire* (Hadzsits). J. O. Lofberg, *Sycophancy in Athens* (van Hook).

Mar. 3. Dr. E. Riess and Professor C. Knapp discuss the number and arrangement of the pictures described in *Aen.* I. 466-493.

Mar. 10. G. M. Stratton, *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle* (C. K.). This work includes text and translation of the fragment *De Sensibus*, and comments by Professor A. E. Taylor.

Mar. 17. Lane Cooper, *The Greek Genius and its Influence* (C. K.). Material for the study of ancient classics in translations.

Mar. 24. E. L. White, *The Vestal Virgins*. This paper studies the sources and supplies a bibliography. W. S. Messer, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (McCartney). T. R. Glover, *From Pericles to Philip* (Ferguson). 'A delightful book.'

Mar. 31. J. L. Hancock, *Studies in Stichomythia* (Bassett). A minute study of the particles in dialogue. E. P. Franklin discusses the possible corruption of the text of Plautus and Terence through the reproduction of manuscripts by dictation.

Apr. 7. F. H. Fowler discusses 'Latin Adjectival Clauses with the Subjunctive,' maintaining that in such clauses the modal meaning is never lost.

Apr. 21. G. Murray, *Religio Grammatici* (Messer). 'This lecture . . . might well form the *credo* of any classicist who wishes to teach and to write with enthusiasm and inspiration.'

May 12. T. Dempsey, *The Delphic Oracle* (Hewitt). A convenient summary.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. II. 1918.

This volume contains 98 pages of letter-press as against 167 pages in Vol. I. But it has 70 plates as against 54; 45 of these illustrate the work of Pietro Cavallini. The Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche shows no diminution in the beauty of its printing notwithstanding the nearness of Bergamo to the seat of war.

There are three articles dealing with classical subjects:

1. *Terracotta arulae*, by E. Douglas Van Buren. 'These arulae originate with the Greek colonies; they are not found however on the Greek mainland, and must therefore reveal a usage and, possibly, a cult either purely local or brought from somewhere other than the mother-country of the settlers. The subjects represented are schemes common to Oriental art, and here the Loryma basis comes to our assistance: for it shows that precisely on an altar basis just such subjects were treated. Presumably, then, the Greek colonists knew of the use of sculptured altars as tomb monuments in Asia Minor at any rate, if not in Greece proper, and in their new homes they perpetuated this form of memorial, but in miniature, depositing it *within* instead of *upon* the tomb. Although this was the original purpose of the arulae, it is easily conceivable that they were soon also dedicated as ex-votos in sanctuaries, or even employed in houses for commemorative or domestic cults, which would account for their presence in temples and dwelling-houses.'

2. *The Gallic Fire and Roman Archives*, by Lucy G. Roberts. It is the purpose of this paper to determine, so far as possible, the effect of the Gallic invasion on the archives of the city. In the descriptions of the rebuilding of the city by Diodorus, Livy, Plutarch, the work on private houses is most emphasized, though Livy and Plutarch speak of the restoration of the temples. But 'there is a striking absence of explicit notices both in regard to the destruction and rebuilding of the city. . . . The

empha
Plutar
such w
tion wa
that so
dedicat
by the
buildin
interv
484 B.C.
of a sim
any int
other e
Sancus
restora
by Tar
restore
survive
Dionys
was ins
belonge
certain.
Fidius,
the Gar
almost
temples
probabl
number

3.
These n
stateme
of inter

Re
P.

that J.
embark
the Nile
Sat. XV
Petrie
(1) Am
describ
(5) the
of the C
employ
by whic
Barbele
adcurare
verbs, e
Aristoph
in the b
Greeks (

emphasis on the *expiatio*, in the description of the rebuilding given by Livy and Plutarch, as well as the fact that the restoration of the temples could take place in such wholesale fashion, seems to indicate that the need of reconstruction and purification was greater than that of rebuilding.' Archaeological evidence seems to show that some at least of the temples escaped destruction. The temple of Saturn was dedicated 498 B.C., not restored till 42 B.C. Such is the tradition, and it is confirmed by the remains. We find the type of construction which is found in pre-Gallic buildings, and the type found in the time of Augustus, but none belonging to the intervening period. Of the temple of Castor, tradition says that it was dedicated in 484 B.C. and restored (first) in 117 B.C. Here again we find remains of construction of a similar character to that found in other buildings of these dates and no trace of any intermediate building. There are several temples for whose survival there is other evidence than that of the extant remains. The temple of *Dius Fidius Semo Sancus*, dedicated 466 B.C., stood till the second century A.D. without any recorded restoration. Dionysius says he saw in this temple the treaty concluded with *Gabii* by *Tarquinius Superbus*. As it is unlikely that this document would have been restored, if destroyed in 387, it seems probable that the treaty and the temple both survived. As to the temple of *Diana* on the *Aventine* founded by *Servius Tullius*, Dionysius says that the bronze pillar on which the treaty then made with the *Latins* was inscribed survived in the temple to his time. Pliny believed that certain statues belonged to the pre-Gallic period. The antiquity of some of these seems reasonably certain. 'The evidence points to the survival of the temples of *Saturn*, *Dius Fidius*, *Diana*, *Ceres*, and perhaps of *Juno*. This regard for temples, on the part of the *Gauls*, is entirely in keeping with their characteristic religiosity. . . . Probably almost all of the international documents deposited on the *Capitoline* and in the other temples escaped destruction. Of the other records, the *leges* in the temple of *Saturn* probably survived, as well as the *senatus consulta*. In this connection, the large number of early *leges* and *senatus consulta* known is of interest.'

3. *Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii*, by A. W. Van Buren. These notes 'are believed to possess a certain value in part as correcting traditional statements about well-known monuments, and in part as calling attention to matters of interest which have long passed unobserved.'

Revue de Philologie. XLI. 3. 1917.

P. Hippolyte Boussac, *L'Exil de Juvénal et l'Ombos de la XV^{me} Satire*. Maintains that *J.* was exiled to the oasis of *El-Khargeh* in *Egypt*. He would probably have embarked at *Puteoli* for *Alexandria*, and have travelled to *Canopus* and thence up the *Nile* to *Tentyris*. While there he learnt the story which forms the subject of *Sat. XV*. *Ombos* is to be identified with the ruins of *Kôm-Belal*, excavated by *Petrie* and *Quibell* in 1895. P. Lejay, *Essais et Notes sur Virgile*. Discusses (1) *Ampsactus*; (2) *ara Palici* (IX. 585); (3) the five elements in X. 100-102 are described in terms of *Pythagoreanism*; (4) the neutrality of the gods in X. 108; (5) the use of *quin* in X. 614; (6) denies *Warde-Fowler's* doctrine (*Vergil's Gathering of the Clans*, p. 65) that *Vergil* repeats the same imagery in the same simile; (7) *Vergil's* employment of nocturnal scenes and moonlight effects; (8) a discussion of the means by which the sense of the middle voice was expressed in *Latin*. An elaboration of *Barbelenet's* view that some compound verbs have the force of a middle, e.g. *adcurare* = 'to give oneself the trouble'; (9) the passive participles of intransitive verbs, e.g. *regnatus*, *triumphatus*. REVIEWS: J. W. White, *Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes* (G. Méantis). Favourable, but some of the statements and hypotheses in the book are 'parfaitement en l'air.' C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (A. Laumonier). A useful summary, but 'ne vise pas à l'originalité.'

XLII. 3. 1918.

A. Ernout, *Cas en -e-et cas en -i- de la troisième déclension dans Lucrèce*. P. Jourdan, *Notes de critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus*. Summaries of French and English periodicals published in 1917.

XLII. 4.

P. Jourdan, *Notes de Critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus*. Review of E. M. Dutton, *Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases*. Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Contains summaries of English and Italian periodicals published in 1917. Revue des comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique. Comptes rendus parus en 1915.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1918.

Nov. 11. J. W. Kohl, *De chorizontibus* (Stürmer). Shrewdly written. Richtsteig, *Libanius qua ratione Platonis operibus usus sit* (Asmus). Highly recommended by the reviewer.

Nov. 25. Axel Boëthius, *Die Pythais* (W. Larfeld). Discusses with acuteness questions connected with the Athenian sacrifice of the Pythais. E. Schröder, *Plotins Abhandlung πῶθεν τὰ κακά*, Enn. I. 8 (Dibelius). Helpful.

Dec. 9. M. Goebel, *Ethnica*. I. (Fr. Cauer). Th. Schermann, *Die allgemeine Kirchenordnung des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Dibelius). The reviewer does not agree with the attempt to ascribe the earliest possible dates to the texts.

Dec. 23. S. Eitrem, *Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte*. II. Kathartisches und Rituelles (Nestle). Often stimulating. G. Dürks, *De Severiano Gabalitano* (Koch).

1919. Jan. 20. T. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Draheim). J. van Wageningen, *Senecas Phaedra* (Gemoll).

Feb. 3. Fr. Boll, *Stern Glaube und Sterndeutung* (Nohl). A short and clear treatment.

Feb. 17. Wohlrab-Lamer, *Die altklassische Welt* (Jäckel). E. Herdi, *Die Herstellung und Verwertung von Käse im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (Blümner).

Mar. 3. O. Stählin, *Editionstechnik* (Bock). A practical handbook. R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie latine*. 4th ed. (Baug). Reviewed in much detail in this and the two following numbers.

Mar. 17. M. A. Schwartz, *Erechtheus et Theseus apud Euripidem et Atthidographos* (Busche). The writer shows good judgment, and does not avoid difficult questions.

Apr. 14. A. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tod des Odysseus* (Drerup). The reviewer considers the results unproven. Chr. Jensen, *Neoptolemos u. Horaz* (Kroll). P. v. d. Mühl, *Der Rhythmus im antiken Vers* (Draheim). The proof is inadequate.

Apr. 28. F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (Viereck). Shows industry and common sense. N. A. Bérès, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des peloponnesischen Klosters Mega Spilaeon*. I. (Boll).

May 12. O. Wichmann, *Platos Lehre von Instinkt und Genie* (Nestle). Interesting and suggestive. L. Radermacher, *Hippolytos und Thekla* (Svoboda). Shows deep appreciation.

May 26. N. Wecklein, *Textkritische Studien zur Ilias* (Brandt). W. A. Baehrens, *Cornelius Labeo atque eius commentarius Vergilianus* (Wessner). The work indicates many correspondences between Labeo and the Virgilian scholia.

June 9. M. Åkerman, *Über die Echtheit der letzteren Hälfte von Tertullians Aduersus Iudaeos* (Koch). In future Tertullian will be out of court for the authorship of cap. 9-14.

June 23. W. Schubart, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Zucker). The writer is a complete master of his material.

ABERCIV
Actoris in
Agar (T.
155 ff.
on
Alcinous,
57 ff.
Aldhelm
Aleuas an
anagnoris
Analogue
con
Archives,
Aristoph
the
Aristotle
Arrius (C
Arulae, te
Atlantis,
Augustus
autumn i

BAAHN a
fifth ce
Bassett (8
Bastarnae
Bradley (8
89 ff.
Brettia, I

Caligula,
' canon,'
Castor, te
' Catholic
Catullus,
Cicero's d
Clemens (8
88
' college o
Colo, the
Colson (F
Controv
corr
conspicior i

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

A.

- ABERCUS, inscription of, 56
 Actoris in the *Odyssey*, 1 ff.
Agar (T. L.), notes on the *Birds* of Aristophanes, 155 ff.
 on the *Ecclesiazusae*, 12 ff.
 Alcinous, humour and satire in the portrayal of, 57 ff.
 Aldhelm glosses in the Corpus glossary, 89 ff.
 Aleuas and Alea, 170 f.
 anagnorisis, 53
 Analogist and Anomalist Controversy, the, 24 ff.
 corrigenda on, 88
 Archives, Roman, and the Gallic fire, 178 f.
 Aristophanes, notes on the *Birds* of, 155 ff.
 the *Ecclesiazusae* of, 12 ff.
 Aristotle's *Poetics*, Vaglimigli's translation of, 175
 Arrius (Catull. 84), 110
 Arulae, terracotta, 178
 Atlantis, identified with Minoan Crete, 8 f.
 Augustus and the cult of Apollo, 174
 autumn in Roman poetry, 54

B.

- ΒΑΑΗΝ and ΔΡΟΜΩΙ in Greek historians of the fifth century, 40 ff.
Bassett (S. E.), Actoris in the *Odyssey*, 1 ff.
 Bastarnae, the, 176
Bradley (H.), remarks on the Corpus Glossary, 89 ff.
 Brettia, Island of, 4

C.

- Caligula, fable aimed at, 83 ff.
 'canon,' history of the term, 35 f.
 Castor, temple of, 179
 'Catholic,' history of the term, 34 f.
 Catullus, *mulier aries*, and other *cruces* in, 134 ff.
 Cicero's *de Inventione*, title of, 175
Clemens (G. T.), note on *conspicior* in Liv. X. (43), 88
 'college of singers,' a Milesian, 55
 Colo, the cognomen, 79 f.
Colson (F. H.), the Analogist and Anomalist Controversy, 24 ff.
 corrigenda on, 88
conspicior in Liv. X. 43, note on, 88

- Cornelia, 174
 Corpus Glossary, remarks on the, 89 ff.
 Crete, Minoan, identified with Homer's *Scheria* and Plato's *Atlantis*, 8 f.
 Curtius, 174
 Cyclopes, 67

D.

- dative, the Indo-European, 53
 Delphian chronology, 53
 Dexia, the gens, 79
 Dioscuri, the, Idas and Lynceus, 22 f.
 Diptych, a Latin-Greek, of A.D. 198, 177

E.

- Ecclesiazusae*, notes on the, 12 ff.
 Elysium, 66
 Ennius and the Punic Wars, 113 ff.
 Erasistratus, 86
Esposito (M.), a ninth-century commentary on Phocas, 165 ff.
 Euripides, *Rhesus* 720, 153 f.
 Eurycleia and Eurynome in the *Odyssey*, 2 f.
 Eustathius, 122 ff.

F.

- Fay (Edwin W.), the phonetics of *MR* in Latin, 37 ff.
Ferguson (A. S.), Plato, *Republic* 321B, 163 ff.
 ferryman of the Dead, 4
finger-doccan (Anglo-Saxon), 105
 future participle in Latin, origin of the, 55

G.

- Gallic Fire, the, and Roman archives, 178
Garrod (H. W.), 'Lombardic,' 51 f.
 Gigantes, 67
 glosses in the text of Sophocles, 118 ff.
Gow (A. S. F.), notes on Theocritus, 20 ff.
 grammatical terminology, influence of, on Christian thought and language, 36
 Greek adjectives ending in -ης, 141 ff.
e-stem nouns, 142 ff.
 neuters in -ος, 148
 rhetors, notes on the, 129 ff.
Greene (Herbert W.), notes on the Greek rhetors, 129 ff.

H.

- Hardy (E. G.)**, *lectio senatus* and *census* under Augustus, 43 ff.
 Professor Elmore's hypotheses, 49 ff.
Horace, *Ep.* I. (4), 109
Housman (A. E.), notes on Martial, 68 ff.
siparum and *supparus*, 149 ff.
How (W. W.), on the meaning of *βάρης* and *δρῦς* in Greek historians of the fifth century, 40 ff.

J.

- Juvenal, exiled to Egypt, 179

L.

- Labeo**, Cornelius, 180
lectio senatus and *census* under Augustus, 43 ff.
Lindsay (W. M.), 'puncto tempore,' 19
 Livy X. 43, note on *conspicior* in, 88
 'Lombardic,' 51 f.
Lucan I. 99-103, 172
 Marcia and Cornelia in, 174
Lucretius II. 355-360, 173

M.

- Macurdy (Grace H.)**, Aleuas and Alea, 170 f.
 maid-servants of Penelope, the, 2 f.
 Marcia, 174
 Martial, notes on, 68 ff.
Matthaei, L. E., 'Studies in Greek Tragedy,' reviewed, 112
McKenzie (Roderick), Greek adjectives ending in -ης, 141 ff.
Merrill (W. A.), on Lucretius II. 355-360, 173
mulier aries and other *cruces* in Catullus, 14 ff.
Munro (J. A. R.), Thucydides on the third of August, 431 B.C., 127 f.
 Mussetius, 80

N.

- negative prefix, *ἀνα-* as compound, 53

P.

- Pearson (A. C.)**, some glosses in the text of Sophocles, 118 ff.
 Phaeacia, 'fairyländ' theories of, 4 ff., 61 ff.
 was it Minoan Crete? 8 ff.
 identified with real places, 10 f.
 Phaeacians, satire in the account of the, 60
 ships of the, 62 ff.
 Phaedriana, 81 ff.
 Phaedrus, date of the, 55
Phillimore (J. S.), Lucan I. 99-103, 172
 Phocas, a ninth-century commentary on, 165 ff.
 phonetics of *MR-* in Latin, the, 37 ff.
 Plato, *Republic* 421B, 163 ff.
 order of the dialogues, 55, 56
Platt (Arthur), Euripides, *Rhesus* 720, 153 f.
 Portus Lunae, 109
Postgate (J. P.), Phaedriana, 81 ff.
 Professor Elmore's hypotheses, 49 ff.
 Ptolemy IV. (Philopator), 112
puncto tempore (-ris), 19

R.

- Remigius of Auxerre, 166
 Rhadamanthys in the *Odyssey*, 65
Richmond (O. L.), *mulier aries* and other *cruces* in Catullus, 134 ff.
 Roman legends, primitive epics the source of, 174

S.

- Saalburg, the, 175
 Saktideva, 5
saed (Anglo-Saxon), 107
 Scheria of the *Odyssey*, the, 4 ff., 57 ff.
 Seneca's Tragedies, 112
 shaving by singeing, 20
Shewan (A.), the Scheria of the *Odyssey*, 4 ff.
 57 ff.
siparum and *supparus*, 149 ff.
 Sitalces, 128
 Σκαυαί πῶλα, 176
 Sophocles, some glosses in the text of, 118 ff.
Steuart (Ethel Mary), Ennius and the Punic Wars, 113 ff.
 Stratonice, 86
 subjunctive after *quisquis*, 73 f.
 Suidas, a fragment of art-criticism in, 56
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 53 ff., 109 ff., 174 ff.
 American Journal of Philology, 53, 174
 Atene e Roma, 109, 174 f.
 Athenaeum (Pavia), 109
 Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 110, 174 ff.
 Bodleian Quarterly Record, 177
 Classical Philology, 54, 177 f.
 Classical Weekly, 55, 110 f., 178
 Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 178 f.
 Mnemosyne, 55
 Rassegna Italiana, 110 f.
 Revue de Philologie, 56, 112, 179 f.
 Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, 112
 Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 56, 180

T.

- Taurini, the, 112
 temperaments, the four, 55
 terracotta *arulae*, 178
 Theocritus, notes on, 20 ff.
 Theophrastus, *Characters* of, 111 f.
 Thucydides on the third of August, 431 B.C., 127 f.
 Thucydides' *History*, divisions of, 111
 Tres Tabernae, 176
 V.
 Vatinian Law, date of, 174
 Vergilian Codex F, 112

Z.

- Zeus invoked at beginning and end of poems, 21
 zodiac, astrological divisions of the, 77

Aeschylus
 Eum
 Theb
 Aristoph
 Aues
 18
 (5)
 81
 (1)
 16
 Eccl
 42
 15
 77
 (9)
 Nub
 Vesp
 Aristot
 Poet
 Catullus
 i. (9)
 13
 1x
 Cicero :
 ad A
 ad. (9)
 de co
 de S
 Corpus I
 IX.

Dio Cas
 (52,
 30
 28
 Ennius :
 Ann
 Euripid
 Rhes

Horace :
 Epp
 Livy :—
 XX
 XX

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

A.
Aeschylus:—

Eum. (486) 121

Theb. (448) 119

Aristophanes:—

Aves (11, 16) 155, (63, 161, 168) 156, (178, 180, 244 *sqq.*, 268) 157, (275, 494, 537) 158, (546, 555, 566, 600, 660, 753) 159, (807, 812, 823, 841, 850, 1081, 1146, 1190) 160, (1221, 1273, 1376, 1441, 1501) 161, (1562, 1608, 1615) 162

Eccl. (234, 292) 12, (307-8, 365, 382) 13, (404, 420, 462) 14, (473, 482, 503, 508, 514, 556) 15, (628, 629, 633, 643, 649, 663) 16, (773, 775, 795, 802 *sqq.*) 17, (836, 864, 891) 18, (912, 1166 *sq.*) 19

Nubes (69, 70) 164

Vesp. (710) 133

Aristotle:—

Poet. 1455a (12-16), 54

C.

Catullus:—

i. (9) 136 ff.; xxv. (5) 134; xxix (20 *sqq.*) 135 f.; XI. (9 *sqq.*) 136; lv. (17) 137 f.; lxvi. (15) 137; lxviii.a and lxviii.b, 138 ff.

Cicero:—

ad Att. xv. 9 (1), 53

ad Q. frat. ii. 9 (3), 72

de consul. ii. (30), 178

de Sen. (27, *coll. de Off.* iii. 57), 73 f.

Corpus Inscr. Lat.:—

IX. (p. 422), 45 xi. (6167) 46

D.

Dio Cassius:—

(52, 42) 45, (53, 1) *ib.*, (54, 10) 46, (54, 28, 30, 35) 47, (55, 6, 12) *ib.*, (55, 13, 14) 48, (56, 28) 49

E.

Ennius:—

Ann. fr. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) 114, (7, 8) 115

Euripides:—

Rhesus (720) 153 f.

H.

Horace:—

Ep. I (4) 109

L.

Livy:—

XXI. (38) 112

XXVI. (51) 115 *sq.*

Lucan:—

I. (99 *sqq.*), 172

VII. (381), 78

Lucilius:—

(68, 472) 19

Lucretius:—

ii. (263) 19; (355 *sqq.*) 173; iv. (214) 19;

vi. (230), 19

M.

Martial:—

i. 68, 68 f.; iii. 20 (1 *sqq.*), 69 f.; v. 16 (5 *sqq.*)

70.; 66, 71; vi. 14, 71 f.; 29 (7 *sq.*) 73 f.;

viii. 56 (17 *sqq.*) 74, ix. 20 (5 *sq.*) 75; 99.

75 f.; x. 24, 76 ff.; xii. 59, 78 ff.; 95

(1) 80

Mon. Ancyr. ii. (2-11) 43 ff.

N.

Nonnos:—

Dionys. 26 (1), 37 (608), 131

P.

Phaedrus:—

III. *prol.* (34 *sqq.*) 69

Novae Fabulae (Thiele, No. XXIII.), 81 f.;

LXX. (Phaedr. IV. xiv), 82 ff.; (XCIV.),

82

Pindar:—

Pyth. 9 (30) Schol., 170

Plato:—

Rep. (421b) 163 ff.

Plautus:—

Capt. (862) 112

Pliny the Younger:—

Ep. ii. 14 (5), 177

Plutarch:—

Vit. Pyrrh. (15) 115; (23, 25) 116

R.

Rhetors (ed. Spengel):—

Alexander, 3 (32, 39, 40) 132

Anon., 5 (119) 130, (149 *coll.* Plut. 2,

1097c) 130, (172) 133, (210, *coll.* Theon 2,

81) 130

Aphthonius, 2 (34) 130

Choeroboscus, 3 (255, *coll.* Anon., 3. 214)

132

Cocondrius, 3 (233) 130

Cornutus, (433) 133, (435, *coll.* Cebes 13)

131, (440, 452, 458 *coll.* Clem. Al. 308,

Ulp. Dem. 9. 6) 133, (459) 131

Longinus, (300) 130, (315) 219
 Menander, 3 (348, 413) 131, (442) 130
 Phoebammon, 3 (54 coll. Anon. 3, 141) 130,
 (551 sq.) 132
 Theon, 2 (71, 83) 130
 Tiberius, 3 (71) 129
 Trypho, 3 (194) 129, (198) 133, (199 coll.
 Cornutus 439, Longin. 264, Dem. Phal. 3,
 307, Arist. *Rhet.* 3. 10. 139, 141) 129
 Zonaeus, 3 (166) 133

S.

Sallust:—

Iug. 38 (10) 176

Seneca:—

Med. 59, 70

Tro. 52, 78

Sophocles:—

Ai. (196) 118, (680) 126, (966) 122 f.

Ant. (223) 120, (368) 124, (446, 527) 118,
 (966, 1246 sqq.) 125

El. (164) 118, 642) 126, (686) 124, (800) 118,
 (947) 120

fr. (279, 581) 119, (800) 120

O.C. (1068 sqq.) 118 f.

O.T. (87 sq.) 120, (276 coll. Eur. *Hipp.* 657,

Aesch. Eum. 486) 121, (425) 126, (476) 119,
 (685, 1031) 120, (1507) 126

Statius:—

Silv. I. 6. (39 sqq.) 70

Suetonius:—

Aug. (27) 44, (37) 48

Tib. (21), 48

Suidas:—

s.v. Σεβαστιανός, 56

T.

Tacitus:—

Dial. 6 (9 sqq.) 110

Theocritus:—

xi. (50 sqq.) 20 f.; xvii. (1 sqq.) 21 f.; xxii.
 (177 sqq.) 22 f.

Thucydides:—

ii. (28) 127 f.

V.

Virgil:—

Aen. i. (574) 174; viii. (588) 88

Catal. 14 (9) 176

ἀγχιθεοί, 6
 ἀθερές, 145
 αἰδής, 145
 αἰσχύνομαι,
 ἀλέκτωρ,
 ἀλεύω, ἀλέ-
 αἰής, 146
 ἀμυκτῆρια
 ἀνα-, comp
 ἀπειρής, 14
 αὔλειος, 16
 ἀφραδής, 1

βάδην, 40

γλεῦκος, 12

δρόμω, 40

ἐνα = ἐνα ἐ-
 ἐμνεός, 5 n
 ἐξισοῦν (So
 ἐστιάτωρ, 1
 εὐσταθής, 1

adcurare, 1
 antiquus In
 aptare, 87
 arcus, * arc

biothanatas
 brat., 37

clasma (Alc
 conspectus,

delirare, 17

emendare, 1
 excludo, 54

III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

A.—GREEK.

A.	K.
ἀγχιθεοί, 61	κάθαρσις, 175
ἀθερές, 145	καθολικός (Gramm.), 33 f.
αἰδής, 145	κανών (Gramm.), 35 f.
αἰσχύνομαι, with acc. of persons, 'blush before,' 13	κατά, 'against,' 119
ἀλέκτωρ, 'avert of evil,' 54	κεκοινμένος (Aristoph.), 12 f.
ἀλεύω, ἀλέομαι, 170	
ἀλής, 146	M.
ἀμπυκτήρια, 119	μίμησις, 175
ἀνα-, compound negative prefix, 53	μνηστέομαι νίκην, 131
ἀτειρής, 146	N.
αὔλειος, 16	νίκος (Hellen.), 147
ἀφραδής, 145	Π.
B.	παραγραφή, 177
βάδην, 40 ff.	(?) παροδέω, 131
Γ.	πηγής, 145
γλυῦκος, 123	πόλιν ὑφαίνειν, 15
Δ.	προσάποδοσις, 132
δρόμω, 40 ff.	Σ.
E.	Σκαιαί πύλαι, 176
ἐνα = ἐνα ἑκάστον, 23	σπουδή, 121
ἐρμεός, 5 n.	Τ.
ἐξισοῦν (Soph.), 125 f.	ὕγις, 145
ἐστιάτωρ, 163	Φ.
εὐσταθής, 146	(?) φιλοτητάριον, 18

B.—LATIN.

A.	F.
adcurare, 179	falcifer Tonans, 70
antiquus Iuppiter, 70 f.	fides, 145
aptare, 87	forma, 40
arcus, 'arc,' 77	formica, 38
B.	formido, 38
biothanatas (Aldhelm), 102	fretus, 37
brat., 37	G.
C.	glandem cenat, 87
clasma (Aldhelm), 100	L.
conspectus, 88	lapsus, 178
D.	Laudiceni, 177
delirare, 174	logi, 'fables,' 69
E.	M.
emendare, 109	muneris auctor, 76
excludo, 54	O.
	occasus, 19

P.

praenaricari, 174
professiones, 50 f.
proprius, sacrificial term, 112
puncto tempore (-ris), 19
pupula duplex, 54

Q.

quisquis, with 2 sing. subjunct., 73 f.

R.

recensus, 49 f.
rediina, 're-dyed', 100

S.

sic = talis, 71
siparum, *sipharum*, 150 f.
supparus, 151 f.
stupor dentium (med.), 106

T.

taratrum, 'auger' (Mediev.), 107

V.

(?) *uiriuola*, 108
uirum putabo, 71 ff.

